EARLY HISTORY OF NORTH INDIA

by the same author

The Śakas in India

Evolution of Hindu Sects

Social Life in Ancient India

Traditional Values in Indian Life

The Achaemenids in India

Some important reference books published by us

Trade and Commerce of Ancient India by Haripada Chakravarti

Internal Market of India by Tarasankar Banerjee

Idea of God by A Seth Pringle Pattison

Demonstration and Logical Truth by Pradip Sengupta

Philosophical Foundations of Bengal Vaisnavism by Sudhin Chakravarti

Principia Axiologia by K. Sukumaran Nair

Nationalisation of Industries in India by K. C Bhandari

Western Influence on Bengali Literature by P R Sen

Students' Marx by Edward Aveling

Our Society and Education by Srinibas Bhattacharya.

Early History of North India

(From the fall of the Mauryas to the death of Harṣa)

SUDHAKAR CHATTOPADHYAYA
Formerly Senior Professor and Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History and Culture, Viśva-Bhāratī University

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
Delhi :: Varanasi :: Patna

© MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
Indological Publishers & Booksellers
Head Office : BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-7
Branches : 1. CHOWK, VARANASI-1 (U.P.)
2. ASHOK RAJPATH, PATNA-4 (BIHAR)

1st Edition : Calcutta, 1958
2nd Edition : Calcutta, 1968
3rd Revised Edition : Delhi, 1976

Price : Rs 90

Printed in India
BY SHANTILAL JAIN, AT SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS, A-45, PHASE-I, INDUSTRIAL AREA, NARAINA, NEW DELHI-28 AND PUBLISHED BY SUNDARLAL JAIN, FOR MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHAR NAGAR, DELHI-7

To
The Sacred Memory
of
PRABODH CHANDRA BAGCHI, M.A.,
Docteur es Lettres (Paris),
VICE-CHANCELLOR, VISVABHARATI UNIVERSITY, 1954-56

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

The book was out of print for nearly two years and I got numerous enquiries from my sympathetic friends as to when it was going to see again the light of the day. A third revised edition is now placed before the scholars, who are especially requested to look at the *Addenda et Corrigenda* where I have examined some new materials and a few theories, without incorporating them in the body of the work as they do not substantially affect my presentation. I offer my thanks to Professor Dr. B. P. Sinha, Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History & Archaeology, Patna University, for some valuable suggestions. I also express my debt of gratitude to Adhyāpakas Sri Santosh Kumar Basu, Dr. Pranabananda Jash and Dr. Vijay Lakshmi Chaudhury for the help I have received from them.

I have followed the same method of transliteration as in the previous editions. The same name (e.g Mathura etc.) has been used with diacritical marks when supposed to denote the ancient *janapada* of that name, but without any mark when signifying modern place name This I have done purposely as in earlier editions, to make a distinction between the old and new place names.

I also take this opportunity to offer my best thanks to M/s Motilal Banarsidass of Delhi for bringing out the present edition. My wife Dr Latika Chattopadhyaya, M A , Ph D. has been a constant source of help and inspiration in my work. My son Abhijit has also helped me in various ways.

I am painfully aware that in spite of my best efforts and care some misprints and omissions have crept into my work and for this I crave the indulgence of the readers.

Santiniketan S Chattopadhyaya

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

An attempt has been made in the present volume to trace the political history of North India from the fall of the Mauryas to the death of Harsa. The idea of writing such a book suggested itself to me when I was a Lecturer at the University of Calcutta and when I found that in most of the works the archaeological sources have not been properly adjusted in the background of other available materials Further, scant attention is paid in these treaties on the Central Asiatic affairs that had undoubtedly important influence on the political destiny of the then India. After I came to the Viśvabharati University, my late lamented teacher Dr P C Bagchi, Vice-Chancellor of the Institution, encouraged me to undertake the task and suggested the plan of the work But alas ! he is no more to see it in its finished form, to appreciate its merit, if there be any, or to point out its short comings

On many crucial points, I have ventured to differ from my *būrva-sūrıs,* but I may humbly assure my readers that I have always been on the guaıd not to be led astray from the *terra firma* of solid facts by an eagerness for theorising In the *Introductıon*, I have tried to point out some of my conclusions, but they are certainly not all Among the literary works, I have utilised all the available Chinese sources, mostly in their French and English translations, and Dr Bagchi himself kindly supplied me with some important data

After the book was sent to the press, some new works e g, *A Comprehensive Hıstory of Indıa*, Vol ii, A K Narain's *The Indo-Greeks,* etc., were published and I had not the opportunity to discuss some of the novel theories advanced in them But my conclusions I think, are in no way affected by them

I pay my humble tribute of respect to Āchārya Dr Nandalal Basu, who kindly prepared for me the drawing embossed on the cover of this book and to Pandit Sukhamay Śāstri *Sapta-Tīrtha*, who helped me in interpreting several Sanskrit

passages. I am indebted to Sri Kalyan Kumar Sarkar, M.A., and to Biswadeb Mukherjee, M.A., formerly my pupils and now my colleagues, for helping me in proof-reading and other works. My sons Dipankar and Bhaskar drew up the map appended at the end of this volume.

I am painfully aware that in spite of my best efforts and care some misprints and omissions have crept into the work and for this I crave the indulgence of the readers.

S. CHATTOPADHYAYA

SANTINIKETAN

CONTENTS

Chapter V—THE ŚAKAS OF WESTERN INDIA

Chapter VI—THE DARK AGE

Chapter VIII—THE AGE OF THE MAUKHARIS

PAGE

CHAPTER IX—THE AGE OF HARṢA

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona
AHD	Ancient History of the Deccan by G. Jouveau-Dubreuil. Pondicherry, 1920
AIU	The Age of Imperial Unity, ed. R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker. Bombay
Allan, Catalogue	A Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum (Ancient India) by J. Allan. London, 1936
AMMK	*Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*
ASR or ASIR	Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports
Arch Surv. West. Ind	Archaeological Survey of Western India
Bayana Hoard	Catalogue of Gupta Coins found in the Bayana Hoard by A. S. Altekar
BDU	Bulletin of the Daçca University
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme Orient, Hanoi
Begram	Recherches Archaeologiques et Historiques sur les kouchans, Memoires de la Delegation archaeologique francaise en Afghanistan, Tome XII, by R. Ghirshman
Bhandarkar no.	A List of Inscriptions of Northern India, by D. R Bhandarkar (Appendix to Ep. Ind, xix-xxiii)
BMC	British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India by P. Gardner. London, 1886
Bom. Gaz	Bombay Gazetteer
BSOS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London
CA	The Classical Age ed R. C Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker. Bombay, 1954
CAGI	Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India ed S N. Majumdar Sastri Calcutta, 1924
Cal Rev.	Calcutta Review
CII, II (i)	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum; Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, ed Sten Konow
CGD	Catalogue of Gupta Coins by Allan, London, 1914
CHI	Cambridge History of India, Vol. 1, ed Rapson

Corpus, III	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. iii, ed J F. Fleet
CSHI	Cambridge Shorter History of India
DHI	Development of Hindu Iconography by J. N Banerjea, Calcutta, 1956
DHNI	Dynastic History of North India, Vol. i by H C. Ray
Dh S	*Dharmasūtra*
DKA	Purāna Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age ed F E Pargiter
DKM	Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha by B P. Sinha
EECA	The Early Empires of Central Asia by W M McGovern
EHI	Early History of India by V. A. Smith (4th ed)
Ep Ind.	Epigraphia Indica
GBI	The Greeks in Bactria and India by W. W. Tarn (1951)
HB	History of Bengal, vol. i, ed R. C. Majumdar (Dacca)
HC Trans	*Harṣacarita,* Eng. Trans by E B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas
HIL	History of Indian Literature, Vol i, by M. Winternitz Eng Trans by Mrs S Ketkar
HK	History of Kanauj by R. S Tripathi
HMHI	History of Mediaeval Hindu India, Vol. i, by C. V. Vaidya
HNI	History of North-Eastern India by R G. Basak, Calcutta, 1934
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
HSL	History of Sanskrit Literature by A B Keith
IC	Indian Culture
IG	The Indo-Greeks by A K Narain (Oxford, 1962)
IHQ	Indian Historical Quarterly
IMC	Catalogue of the Coins in the Indian Museum, Vol. i ed. V. A. Smith
Ind. Ant. or IA	Indian Antiquary
Intro.	Introduction

JA	Journal Asiatique, Paris
JAHRS	Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JARS	Journal of the Assam Research Society
JASB	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
JBORS	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society
JBRS	Journal of the Bihar Research Society
JDL	Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University
JGIS	Journal of the Greater India Society
JIH	Journal of Indian History
JKHRS	Journal of the Kalinga Historical Research Society
JNSI	Journal of the Numismatic Society of India
JPASB	Journal and the Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland
JRASB(L)	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Letters)
JUPHS	Journal of the U P Historical Society
Keilhorn, no	A List of Inscriptions of Northern and Southern India (Appendix to Ep Ind. v, vii)
Life (Beal)	The Life of Hiuen Tsang, by Shaman Hwui Li, with an Introduction etc by S Beal, London, 1914
Luders, no	List of Brāhmī Inscriptions (Appendix to Ep. Ind. x)
MASI	Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India
Mbh	*Mahābhārata*
NHIP	Same as VGA
NIA	New Indian Antiquary, Bombay
Num Chron (NC)	Numismatic Chronicle
Periplus	The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea ed. W H Schroff
PHAI	Political History of Ancient India by H C Raychaudhuri (5th edition, 1950)
PIHC	Proceedings of the Indian History Congress
PMC	Catalogue of the Coins in the Punjab Museum, Vol i by R B. Whitehead

POC (AIOC)	Proceedings of the Oriental Conference
Ptolemy	McCrindle's Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, ed S N Majumdar Sastri
Rapson, Catalogue	British Museum Catalogue of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, Western Kshatrapa Dynasty, the Traikutaka Dynasty and the Bodhi Dynasty ed. E. J. Rapson
Records (Beal)	Buddhist Records of the Western World (Si-yu-ki) by S Beal
Select Ins.	Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization, Vol i ed D C. Sircar, Calcutta, 1942
SHAIB	Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal by B. C. Sen, Calcutta, 1942
SI	The Śakas in India by S Chattopadhyaya
SPIH	The Scythian Period of Indian History by Von Lohuizen-de Leeuw, Leiden, 1949
Suc Sat	The Successors of the Sātavāhanas by D. C. Sircar
Thom Com. Vol	Thomas Commemmoration Volume
VGA	A New History of the Indian People, Vol vi: *The Vākāṭaka-Gupta Age,* ed R C Majumdar and A S Altekar Banaras, 1954
Vizag Dist. Gaz	Vizagapatam District Gazètteer
Watters	On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India by T Watters London, 1908
Wylie	Notes on the Western Regions. Trans of ch 96, part i and ch 61 *fols* 1-6 of the *Tsien-Han-shu* of Pan-ku. Journal of the Anthropological Institute, Vol x, 1881
Wylie I	Translation of Ch 96, part ii of the above. *Ibid* Vol xi, 1881
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft

INTRODUCTION

In the middle of the third century B C., the great Seleucidan empire of Western Asia betrayed signs of disintegration, and two of the easternmost provinces, *Bactria* and *Parthia,* gradually became independent states. The events thus happening outside the natural frontiers of India produced, however, important repercussions on her political fortune. Hemmed on the west by the new state of Parthia and on the east by the nomads of Central Asia, Bactria naturally wanted an outlet to the bigger world for her very economic existence. She turned her attention towards the rich plains of India, and Demetrius an young and energetic ruler of the state, invaded the land and even knocked at the doors of Pātaliputra, the royal metropolis of the great Aśoka and his successors. It will be seen in the subsequent pages, that this invasion offered an opportunity to the Maurya general Pusyamitra who killed his master Brhadratha and usurped the throne for himself. Though for a time he maintained the Imperial tradition of the Mauryas, the invasion dealt a heavy blow to the *Cakravartin* ideal and the spirit of local autonomy now came to the forefront. Archaeological evidences clearly prove that the descendants of Pusyamitra were not Imperial suzerains but became reduced to the position of a petty local dynasty at Vidiśā, and the Ganges-Jumna valley, including the Rajasthan, became studded with petty states, some monarchical and some in the nature of republics. Thus it appears to be a misnomer to think of a Śuṅga age in Indian history, and, the account of the Purānas also does not really go against such a view (p. 28-31). By this time, on the other hand, the Punjab and the North Western Frontier Province came under the occupation of the Greeks, who, however, became involved in civil war and thus there arose, two different ruling houses among them Menander, who flourished in the first century B C. (not in the second century B.C , as thought by Rapson, Tarn and others) evidently brought a new trend in the Hellenistic rule over the land It is difficult to agree with the view that he belonged to the house of Euthydemus He appears to have been plebeian (p. 44-45) and thus it is difficult to deter-

mine exactly the lineage of the Greek kings who ruled after him.

In the middle of the second century B.C. (c. 165 B C) there began a great tribal movement in Central Asia. Toynbee points out that at a cycle of 600 years the steppes of Eurasia see alternately the increase and decrease of humidity and aridity of the climate, and the consequent periodic increase in the fertility of the soil attracts denser population, and the subsequent decrease of fertility and the consequent shortage of food supply drive the nomads in search of new homes. (*A Study of History*, Vol iii. pp. 395ff). But in case of the large scale migration of the tribes in the second century B C, we find altogether a different process at work, a process created not by nature but by man In any case, as a result of this movement, a Śaka kingdom became established in Kashmir, and the history of this kingdom can be traced in brief outline upto c. 7 B.C. (pp. 64-65), after which Kashmir became a part of the kingdom of the Śaka king Maues, who ruled not about 80 B C, as suggested by some scholars, but evidently at the close of the first century B.C. and the beginning of the first century A D. (pp. 66-67ff). Maues supplanted from Taxila the rule of the Greeks who, however, still continued to thrive on the other side of the Indus The Śaka successors of Maues put an end to the rule of the Hellenistic princelings, excepting in the Kabul valley, and then the Scythians in their turn had to make room for the Parthians. The greatest of the Parthian kings Gondopharnes began his rule in Eastern Iran in 19 A D (not in Taxila at that date as suggested by Tarn and others), and sometimes before 64 A.D the Kusānas came and occupied the dominion ruled over by the successors of the Parthian monarch. It was evidently due to this Parthian pressure that the Śakas of the North Western Frontier Province and the Punjab were forced to move towards the south and thus the Śaka rule came to be established in Western India. The date of the Śaka king Nahapāna has been a moot question with the Indologists, and attempt has been made in the subsequent pages to show that the dates in his inscriptions refer to his regnal year, and not to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. (pp. 124ff).

The history of the Kusāṇa kings in India presents some difficulties. An attempt has been made to show that Kaniska I, who was originally a governor of Vima Kadphises, came to the throne at the end of 78 A.D., while his Master was still a king and then conquered his rivals, and one such rival is evidently referred to in the Taxila Silver Scroll record of the year 136 (p. 93). The theory of Ghirshman regarding the date of Kaniska I has been fully discussed and additional arguments have been brought forth in support of the 78 A D theory (pp. 92ff). After Kaniska I, Vāsiska ruled for four years, and then there was possibly a partition of the Kusāna empire, though for a temporary period only (p. 110 & pp 120f). The disintegration of the Kuṣāna empire began from the eastern side. Epigraphic and numismatic evidences show that as early as c 130 A D., when Huviska had been ruling, Kauśāmbī became an independent kingdom (pp. 140ff), while the Muruṇḍas extended their rule from Magadha to Ayodhya on the west (pp. 144ff) The Kusānas maintained a precarious existence in the Mathura region, wherefrom they were ultimately driven out by the Nāgas in conjunction with several republican states of Rajasthan and the Eastern Punjab Thus North India was in a highly chaotic political condition, and though the descendants of the great Kaniska carved out for themselves a kingdom in the North Western Frontier Province and the Western Punjab, are long they had to acknowledge the supremacy of the Sassanids of Iran who now extended their sway as far as the Avanti region and even the successors of Rudradāman I had to take on them the yoke of foreign servitude (pp. 160-5).

With the rise of the Guptas in the first quarter of the fourth century A.D., India enters into a new phase of her history The question of the original home of the dynasty has been discussed afresh (pp. 166ff) and I have also tried to solve the problem of successions after Skanda Gupta. It has been shown further that the Epthalites could not have occupied the interior of India before 510 A.D., for the evidences of the Chinese sources, as pointed out by Chavannes, bearing on the history of the tribe appear to be conclusive on the point

In Ch. viii, the history of the Maukharis, who became the Imperial lords after the fall of the Guptas in c 551 A.D has been critically discussed and I have tried to show that the clash of the dynasty with the *so-called* Later Guptas was confined to the reign of Iśānavarman alone, while the notion of a long-standing rivalry between the two is really based on a wrong interpretation of an epigraphic passage. It has been shown also that a Tibetan invasion of Eastern India in the last quarter of the sixth century A D paved the way for the rise of Śasānka and the evidence of the Rhotashgadh Seal should now be interpreted in a different way in the light of the *She-kia-fang-che.*

In Ch. ix, the chronology of Harsa's campaigns has been discussed fully, and in the light of the available Chinese evidences we may possibly conclude that his *dig-vijaya* was really undertaken during the period 618-624 A D., and that he possibly defeated Śaṣāṅka.

I have given above only some of the new points that I have tried to emphasise upon I would humbly request the readers to consider further my treatment of minor details here and there, and I shall feel myself amply rewarded if my book be of any service to them.

CHAPTER I

PUṢYAMITRA AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS

I

THE YAVANA INVASION AND THE FALL OF THE MAURYAS

FALL OF THE MAURYAS

The *Purāṇas* inform us that "the ten Mauryas will enjoy the earth full 137 years. After them it will go to the Śuṅgas. Puṣyamitra, the Commander-in-chief, will uproot Bṛhadratha and will rule the kingdom for 36 years".

The *Harsacarita* of Bāṇabhaṭṭa gives us a few details about the incident:

"While reviewing the army, under the pretext of showing him his forces, the base-born (anārya) general Puṣyamitra crushed his master, Bṛhadratha, the Maurya, who was weak in keeping his coronation oath."[1]

From the above account the following facts emerge:

(i) Since it is supposed that the Imperial Maurya dynasty came to existence in c.324 B.C., Puṣyamitra became king in c.187 B.C.

(ii) That Puṣyamitra was anārya *i.e.*, a man of low origin, and that he ruled for 36 years.

(iii) That the last Maurya king was killed while he had been reviewing his army, which was either a mere routine duty or occasioned by some emergency.

We shall take up the third of the above items first as it is connected with many cognate problems. Writing in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1910, p. 261, Mm. H. P. Śāstrī observes: "At first he (Puṣyamitra) led the Maurya armies against the Greeks, who advanced year after year to the very

1 *HC*. Trans., p 193; *IA*, II p. 363.

heart of the Maurya empire. After a successful campaign he returned to Pāṭaliputra with victorious army, and the feeble representative of Aśoka on the throne accorded him a fitting reception A camp was formed outside the city and a review was held of a large army. In the midst of the festivities an arrow struck the king on the forehead. The king expired instantly." We do not know on what authority the account is based, but it shows at any rate that Mm Śāstrī is inclined to think that a Greek invasion of India took place the very year when the Maurya dynasty came to an end

On the evidence of Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* scholars generally believe that there was really a Yavana invasion during the rule of Puṣyamitra. While illustrating the use of the affix *laṅ*, which denotes *an action that happened out of sight, but within the range of the sight of the narrator,* Patañjali gives the examples, *aruṇad Yavanaḥ Sāketaṃ aruṇad Yavanah Madhyamikām*,[1a] 'the Yavana besieged Sāketa (Ayodhyā), the Yavana besieged Madhyamikā (near Chitor)' Patañjali was a contemporary of Puṣyamitra since while illustrating the use of the present tense (Pāṇini III. 2 123, Vār. 1) he gives the example '*Iha Puṣyamitraṃ yājayāmah*', 'here we are causing Puṣyamitra to perform sacrifice'.

From the illustrations of Patañjali, however, it does not absolutely follow that the Yavana invasion of Sāketa and Madhyamikā occurred during the reign of Puṣyamitra. It is not unlikely that the event took place before Puṣyamitra ascended the throne but it was still remembered or rather was "*within the range of sight*" of Patañjali. In this connection it may be noted that the *Yuga Purāṇa* section of the *Gārgī Saṃhitā* speaks of a Yavana invasion of North-India sometimes after the reign of the Maurya king *Śāliśūka* in the following words: "Then the viciously valiant Greeks, after reducing Sāketa, the Pañcāla country and Mathurā, will reach (or take) Kusumadhvaja".[2]

1a *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, III. 2 111
2 *JBORS*, xiv 1928. p. 402.

The mention of Sāketa in both the *Mahābhāsya* and the *Yuga Purāṇa* accounts shows evidently that the same event is alluded to, as pointed out by B. C Sen, de la Vallee-Poussin and other scholars, and, as it occurred before the time of Puṣyamitra's sacrifice, it is not unlikely that it occurred when Bṛhadratha had been marshalling his forces. For further light on the topic we have to turn to the history of the Bactrian Greeks.

RISE OF BACTRIA

Bactriana, comprising the present province of Balkh, was transformed into a military colony when Alexander the Great visited the place in c 328 B.C. Later on, it became a part of the Seleucid empire with its capital at Syria. From the accounts of the Classical writers, we learn that about the middle of the third century B.C., when the Seleucid Emperors were pre-occupied in the west, Diodotos I, the governor of the thousand cities of Bactria, revolted and assumed the title of king. According to Justin, he was succeeded by his son Diodotos II. The numismatic evidences show, however, that the revolution was a slow process, and it is doubtful whether Diodotos I ever assumed the title of king as he issued no coins in his *own* name. We have coins of Diodotos II showing that the revolution really became complete in his time. Tarn thinks that the movement started possibly after 246 B C. and Diodotos II "who took the royal title, was on the throne in 228 or 227".[3] According to Justin, almost at the same time when the Bactrian revolt began, Parthia in Northern Iran also revolted under Arsaces, though at first there was no common tie between the two On the contrary, Justin informs us that out of the fear of Diodotos I, Arsaces always kept his army in readiness, specially after he seized Hyrcania. Diodotos II made alliance of peace with Parthia, and this was evidently a prelude to his declaration of full and formal independence, as proved by the issue of coins in his own name.

3 *GBI* p 74

Macdonald assigns three reasons for the revolt of these two Seleucidan provinces. *Firstly,* the Seleucidan kings "Antiochus II (261-246), like his two immediate successors, Seleucus II (246-226) and Seleucus III (226-223) was too much preoccupied with wars and rumours of wars in the west, to maintain a proper hold over his eastern dominions." *Secondly,* the example of the great Maurya empire must have inspired them; and, *thirdly,* the pressure of the nomadic tribes in Central Asia was a constant threat to their existence, specially to Bactria, and "Diodotos may well have felt that an independent kingdom strong in its new-born sense of national unity, was likely to be a more permanent bulwark against barbarian aggression than the loosely attached extremity of an empire whose head was in no position to afford efficient protection to his nominal subjects."[4]

Diodotos II must have died before 206 B.C for when in that year Antiochus III the Great, the Seleucid king, went to recover the lost province, the throne of the country was occupied by one Euthydemus, a native of Magnesia. Polybius informs us that Euthydemus requested Antiochus to desist from attacking him on the ground that "he was not a rebel. Others no doubt had rebelled He had put the *children* of the rebels to death and that was how he happened to be the king".[5] This statement has been interpreted by most of the scholars to mean that Euthydemus killed Diodotos II and usurped the throne for himself If, however, the above translation is correct, it gives us entirely a different meaning. The term 'children' is significant in the above passage. It shows evidently that Diodotos II died a premature death (his coins show the portrait of a young man), leaving minor sons, the natural heirs, who were killed by Euthydemus, and Diodotos II was the rebel in the true sense of the term.

In any case, when the siege was going on, Euthydemus sent his young son Demetrius for negotiations, and we are in-

4 *CHI*, p. 439
5 Polybius, xi. 34

formed that Antiochus was so much impressed at the talk and demeanour of the young prince that he not only recognised the independence of Bactria but also gave his own daughter in marriage to him. The whole story indeed reads like a romance. The presence of the nomads nearby in the steppes of Central Asia really solved the problem Euthydemus threatened to call the Śakas if the siege was not withdrawn "and pointed out the general disaster which would ensue; and Antiochus wisely made peace, left him his kingdom, and concluded an alliance".[6]

From the description of Polybius it appears that after the Bactrian affairs, Antiochus the Great crossed the Caucasus (Hindukush) and descended into India and "renewed his friendship with Sophagasenus, the king of the Indians; received more elephants, until he had 150 altogether, and having once more provisioned his troops, set out again personally with his army, leaving Androsthenes of Cyzicus, the duty of taking home the treasure which this king had agreed to hand over to him". Sophagasenus or Subhāgasena may have been a grandson of Aśoka, as Prof. F. W. Thomas suggests, "quoting the statement of Tāranātha, the Tibetan historian, that Aśoka's son Vīrasena was the king of Gandhāra and observing how names in—sena run in families". Thus we find that in c 206 B.C. the Mauryas were still ruling in India, and that the Baetrian invasion of India had not yet begun.

Leader of the Yavana Invasion

Euthydemus now got a free hand to extend his empire. His coins indicate that he conquered Arachosia, Seistan and the Paropamisadae. Tarn has adduced good grounds for believing that Euthydemus died about 189 B.C., when his son Demetrius came to the throne[7] We have seen that the Maurya dynasty came to an end in 187 B C and if in that year there was any Yavana invasion (*supra*, p. 2), which may have indirectly con-

6 *GBI*, p 82
7 *Ibid*.

tributed to the fall of the Imperial dynasty, its leader naturally had been Demetrius. As the Classical account on the conquest of India by the Bactrian kings is somewhat confused one, we shall first take up this topic and then discuss the question of chronology.

On the authority of Apollodorus of Artemita, Strabo ascribes the conquest of India partly to Demetrius and partly to Menander, while Justin, on the authority of Trogus, to Apollodotus and Menander From this Rapson has concluded that "it seems probable that Apollodotus and Menander, as well as Demetrius, belong to the house of Euthydemus, and that all these three princes were contemporary"[7a] Tarn also accepts the theory of Rapson that Demetrius, Apollodotus and Menander were contemporary, and thinks further that Apollodotus was a younger brother of Demetrius, while Menander was a general under Demetrius and later on married his daughter Agathocleia. It is further assumed that when Demetrius invaded India, the Greek army was divided into two distinct divisions, one under the general Menander advanced towards the east as far as Pātaliputra, while Demetrius himself led the other army down the Indus valley.[7b]

Rapson's theory is based chiefly on the fact that some of the square copper coins of Menander and Eucratides "are so similar in style that they may reasonably be assigned not only to the same general period, but also to the same region—a region which must have passed from one rule to the other".[8] Demetrius was a contemporary of Eucratides, as we shall see later on, and hence of Menander as well. It is, however, somewhat difficult to agree with Rapson, for such deduction from the evidence of one series of coins only is often risky. Thus the round coins of Demetrius, with types "*Elephants' head: Caduceus*," agree very closely with some of the round issues of Maues,[8a] but nobody would think that Maues was a contempo-

7a *CHI*, p 543
7b *GBI*, p. 142
8 *CHI*, p. 551.
8a *SI*, p. 15.

rary of Demetrius. Gardner and Whitehead are of definite opinion that by the usual style of type and technique the coins of Menander must be pronounced decidedly later than the splendid money of Demetrius. In this connection we should also consider the evidence of the Shinkot inscription of Menander mentioning Viyakamitra, a feudatory under him. This Viyakamitra has been identified with Vijayamitra, who is known from the coins as the father of Indravarman or Itravarman, father of Aspavarman, who served at first as a strategos under Azes II and later on transferred his allegiance to Gondopharnes, the Parthian monarch.[9] From the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription we learn that Gondopharnes had been ruling in 45 A.D. and that he came to the throne in 19 A.D.,[10] and as Vijayamitra was remote by only three generations from him, his date must be in the first century B.C., when consequently Menander also ruled. The identification of Vijayamitra with Viyakamitra, however, is not accepted by all scholars. Thus while editing the Shinkot inscription in the *Epigraphia Indica*, xxiv, pp 1ff, N. G. Majumdar concluded that they were different persons, belonging to the same dynasty. He thinks that the whole record may be divided into two parts, the earlier portion (A & B) being composed during the time of Viyakamitra, and the later portion (C, D & E) at the time of Vijayamitra. He thinks, however, that "the difference in age between the two sets of inscriptions was probably little more than fifty years". Thus even if we do not accept the proposed identification, it shows that Menander and Demetrius cannot be contemporary.[10a]

As Eucratides restruck the coins of Apollodotus it appears that the latter was a contemporary of Demetrius Apollodotus was evidently a sub-king under Demetrius, and as he has no extensive coinage showing a long reign, it is not unlikely that he was killed by Eucratides who then occupied his dominion

9 *Num. Chron*, 1944, pp. 99-104; *IC*, xiv, p. 205f

10 *Infra* Ch III.

10a According to the Milinda-pañho, Milinda or Menander flourished "500 years" after the Parinirvāṇa (Milinda-pañho, ed. Trenckner, p. 3).

and restruck his coins[11] The *Periplus*, however, informs us that his coins, along with those of Menander, were in circulation in the port of Barygaza in its time (60-80 A D.).

THE YAVANA RETREAT

Thus the leader of the Yavana invasion referred to in the *Gārgī Saṃhitā* and the *Mahābhāṣya* was Demetrius. After stating that the Yavanas will advance as far as Kusumadhvaja or Pāṭaliputra the *Yuga Purāṇa* relates.

> *"The Yavanas intoxicated with fighting, will not stay in the Madhyadeśa; there will be undoubtedly a civil war among them, arising in their own country, there will be a very terrible and a ferocious war".*[12]

The interpretation of the statement of the *Yuga Purāna*, has often misled the scholars to think that the Yavanas quitted the Madhyadeśa because a civil war broke out in their own country A study of the original passage shows that it contains two distinct statements without any necessary causal connection between the two. We cannot hold on the evidence of the *Yuga Purāṇa* that the rise of Eucratides had anything to do with the withdrawal of Demetrius from the Gangetic valley. The Classical writers also simply state that one Eucratides occupied the throne of Bactria when Demetrius was out on his Indian conquest, but nowhere it is stated that this conquest was being carried on in the Gangetic valley country. We shall see later on that Demetrius went in the south as far as Sindh and it is not unlikely that Eucratides usurped the throne of Bactria during such conquests. According to Justin, Eucratides came to power almost at the same time that Mithridates ascended the throne among the Parthians. Mithridates ruled from c.171 to 138/7 B C, and we may thus assume that the Greek civil war referred to in the *Gārgī Samhitā* occurred about 171 B.C

11 For the coins of Apollodotus, *PMC*, pp. 40-49 , *BMC*, p 34.
12 *JBORS*, xiv. 1928 ; p 403.

II

THE REIGN OF PUSYAMITRA

SOURCES

Our chief sources for studying the history of Puṣyamitra's reign besides the *Purānas,* the *Harṣucarita* and the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, as already indicated, are : (i) the *Therāvalī* (genealogical or succession-table of the kings of Ujjayinī) by Merutunga, a famous Jaina author, who flourished in the first half of the fourteenth century A.D., (ii) the *Mālavikāgnimitram* of Kālidāsa ; (iii) the Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva, *Ep Ind.*, xx, p. 57 ; and, (iv) the concluding portions of the *Divyāvadāna,* xxix. Jayaswal has drawn our attention to the fact that there is an indirect hint to Puṣyamitra in the *Harivaṃśa* as well.

DURATION OF REIGN

Merutuṅga says that, after the Nandas, the Mauryas ruled for 108 years, and "after the Mauryas, Puṣyamitra ruled for 30 years". Now, the *Matsya Purāna* assigns 36 years to Pusyamitra, while the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇda Purānas* state that Puṣyamitra ruled for 60 years. Pargiter prefers the Matsya account and rejects the other one (60 years) as copyist's error It will be seen in this connection that while the *Purānas* attribute a period of 137 years to the Mauryas, Merutuṅga splits the period into two parts, 108 years for the Mauryas, and 30 years for Puṣyamitra. Merutunga was a late writer and hence his attribution of 30 years reign-period to Puṣyamitra may not be strictly correct. But if we remember the fact that the Jaina account is written from the point of view of Avantī while the *Purāna* account from the point of view of Pāṭaliputra, we may possibly conclude that for the last few years of Maurya rule, Puṣyamitra was the *de facto* ruler in the Avantī region, and held simultaneously the position of the commander-in-chief under the Imperial Mauryás[13] He thus

13 Cf *IHQ*, I pp 92-3.

to some extent may be compared with Rānā Mān Singh of Ambar during Akbar's time. Thus when the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇas* state that Pusyamitra ruled for 60 years, they evidently take into account a portion of his rule in the Avantī region prior to his accession to the throne at Pāṭaliputra, and hence we can hardly reject the account at once as a case of copyist's error.

It may of course be argued that in such a case, the reign of Puṣyamitra becomes abnormally long one But if we remember the fact that in the *Mālavikāgnimitram* his grandson Vasumitra is described as being in charge of the sacrificial horse of his grandfather and as fighting against the Yavanas, showing that he must have been quite mature in age, we can possibly conclude that Puṣyamitra really had a very long life. Thus 60 years of reign (*cf.* George III of England) —24 years as a subordinate ruler and 36 years as independent one (*cf.* the Matsya account)—may not be impossible in his case.

Account of the Mālavikāgnimitram

The *Mālavikāgnimitram* supplies us with the following three interesting informations:

(i) that Agnimitra, son of Puṣyamitra, belonged to the *Baimbika-kula ;*

(ii) that Puṣyamitra with the purpose of performing an Aśvamedha sacrifice let loose a horse under the leadership of Vasumitra, son of Agnimitra, who was accompanied by hundred other royal princes. The horse entered the territory of the Yavanas on the bank of the river *Sindhu* and a terrible fighting ensued in which the Yavanas were defeated ;

(iii) that Pusyamitra's son Agnimitra was his father's viceroy at Vidiśā while the kingdom of Vidarbha lay to the south under its king Yajñasena. There followed a war between Vidiśā and Vidarbha in which the former was victorious Vidarbha was divided into two parts with the river Varadā (Wardha) forming the boundary between the two states,

one remaining under Yajñasena and the other under Mādhavasena, a cousin of Yajñasena and a partisan of Agnimitra.

(i) The *Purāṇas* make Puṣyamitra the founder of the Śunga dynasty. Pāṇini connects the Śungas with the well-known Brāhmaṇa family of the Bhāradvājas, whereas in the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, Puṣyamitra is described as *base-born,* showing that he was not a Brāhmaṇa The *Divyāvadāna,* on the other hand, makes Pusyamitra the last king of the Imperial Maurya dynasty, a statement which seems to support the *Harṣacarita* account, for according to the Brāhmaṇical tradition the Mauryas were Śūdras, *i.e.,* base-born. Jayaswal points out that in the *Harivamśa* we have got the account of a Senānī, a certain Brāhmaṇa of the Kāśyapa family, who performed the horse-sacrifice in the Kali age, and he is given further the epithet of *Audbhijja, 'one who suddenly rises from underground',* indicating that the uprising Senāpati or Senānī is no other than Puṣyamitra. It is thus apparent that while the sectarian Brāhmaṇical works like the *Purāṇas* and the *Harivaṃśa* describe him as a Brāhmana, the non-sectarian work like the *Harṣacarita* represents him as a Śūdra. As Dr. Raychaudhuri points out: "It is, however, to be noted that the *Harṣacarita* never applies the designation Śuṅga to Puṣyamitra himself, but only to one of the latest kings in the *Purānic* list. The *Purāṇas* may have combined the Baimbikas and Śuṅgas under the common name of Śuṅga".[14] The term Baimbika may be connected with the river Bimbikā mentioned in the Bharhut inscriptions.[15]

(ii) The mention of the fact that Puṣyamitra's men defeated the Yavanas on the bank of the river Sindhu is very interesting showing that the Yavanas had already left the Madhyadeśa country. There has been some controversy regarding the identification of the river, and Rapson thinks that "the choice seems to lie between the Kālisindhu, a tributary of the

14 *PHAI*, p. 369. f n 2.
15 *Bharhut Ins* ed. Sinha and Barua p 8.

Charmanvatī (Chambal) flowing within a hundred miles of Madhyamikā (near Chitor), which was besieged by the Yavanas, and the Sindhu, a tributary of the Jumna which would naturally be passed by invading forces on the route between Mathurā (Muttra) and Prayāga (Allahabad)".[16] A third alternative is also possible and the Sindhu may be identified with the Indus. The fact that in the *Mālavikāgnimitram* the court of Vidiśā is represented as absolutely ignorant of the whole thing and that Agnimitra first learnt about the victory from a letter written by Puṣyamitra seems to indicate that the Sindhu where the operations took place was far away from Vidiśā, and points to the identification of the river with the Indus[17] After this victory, Puṣyamitra performed a horse-sacrifice. In the Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva, Puṣyamitra is described as the performer of two horse-sacrifices, one of which is evidently referred to in the drama of Kālidāsa, and the other was possibly performed immediately after his accession to the throne, and after he had driven out the Yavanas from the Madhyadeśa country.

(iii) We know practically nothing about Yajñasena, the king of Vidarbha, with whom Agnimitra came to a war. In the *Cambridge History of India*, it has been supposed that either he was an Andhra or a feudatory of the Andhras.[18] If the *Purāṇas* are to be believed, however, the Andhras or the Sātavāhanas came to power not only after the fall of the Śuṅgas but of the Kāṇvas, for it is stated that the first king of the Andhra-Sātavāhana dynasty, Simuka, overthrew Suśarman, the last Kāṇva king. Rapson and many other scholars, relying on the testimony of the *Matsya Purāṇa* that the Andhras ruled for four centuries and a half, assign Simuka towards the close of the third century B.C. calculating backwards on the well established fact that the Sātavāhana rule came to an end in the first quarter of the third century A.D. Now, on

16 *CHI* p 520
17 R C. Majumdar *IHQ*, I p 217.
18 *CHI*, p. 519.

this point the *Purāṇic* accounts contradict each other. While the different *Mss.* of the *Matsya Purāṇa* assign to the Andhras a period of more than 400 years, in certain *Vāyu* manuscripts it is 272½ years[18a]. In any case after his defeat at the hand of Agnimitra, Puṣyamitra's son and viceroy, Yajñasena possibly acknowledged the suzerainty of the Senāpati ruler.

ANTI-BUDDHIST ACTIVITIES

From the *Divyāvadāna,* it appears that Puṣyamitra resided at Pāṭaliputra which was evidently his capital. The work has recorded his activities against the religion of the Śākyamuni and there is no reason to disbelieve the account. The Tibetan historian Tāranātha also says that Puṣyamitra burnt a number of monasteries from the Madhyadeśa as far as Jālandhara[19] The *Divyāvadāna* states that once he proceeded to destroy the Kukkuṭārāma monastery but was frightened by the roar of a lion at the gate and returned to Pāṭaliputra. After reaching Śākala, he issued a proclamation to the effect that whoever would present him with the head of a Śramaṇa would be rewarded with 100 dināras. Ultimately, however, he failed in his attempt and was killed by a Yakṣa named Kṛmīśa.[20] There are indeed some supernatural elements in these stories, but at the same time we cannot ignore the apathy of the Buddhist writers towards him. The Buddhists may have suffered in his hand that led to the invention of such stories, and it is not unlikely that the stūpas at Bharhut and Sanchi were constructed after his death, and that he had nothing to do with them.

ADMINISTRATION

From the meagre evidences available it appears that Puṣyamirta continued the framework of the administration prevailing in the days of the Mauryas. Princes of the royal blood

18a Vide. *JIH*, 1966 (August)
19 *IHQ*, I p 219
20 P. C Bagchi, *IHQ*, xxii, pp 81ff

were appointed governors in the provinces. Pusyamitra's son Agnimitra was one such governor in the province of Vidiśā, while another of the same rank may have been the governor of Ayodhyā, for the inscription of Dhanadeva discovered from that place describes the latter as "the sixth (in descent) from Puṣyamitra".[21] Royal princes were also placed in charge of the army, at least at the time of war, as is apparent from the appointment of Vasumitra as the guardian of the sacrificial horse. Patañjali refers to the sabhā of Puṣyamitra,[22] while the *Mālavikāgnimitram* mentions the *amātya-pariṣad* of Agnimitra Here also the Maurya pattern was followed. In the R E VI of Aśoka we have reference to the *parisā*, while the Maurya kumāras were also assisted by a body of mahāmātras [23]

III

THE GRECO-BACTRIAN KINGS

Demetrius

We have already seen that the Bactrian king Demetrius, who was a contemporary of Puṣyamitra, possibly invaded the interior of India and Pāṭaliputra, in c 187 B C. Demetrius' Indian coins are extremely rare and they have been found only in the North-Western India. This shows clearly that the Madhyadeśa region was under his occupation for only a very short period of time, and credit is due to Puṣyamitra for driving the Yavanas out of the Ganges-Yumna valley. A critical study of Strabo's account of the conquests of Demetrius and Menander shows that many of them should be ascribed to Demetrius alone. Thus Strabo says "They got possession not only of Patalene (the Indus Delta), but of the kingdom of Saraostos (Surāṣtra or Kathiawad) and Sigerdis

21 *Select Ins.*, p. 96, f.n. 3.
22 *Mahābhāṣya* on Pāṇini, I 1 58 , *Vārtika*, 7.
23 *Ep Ind* , iii, p. 137

which constitute the remainder of the coast... They extended their empire even as far as the Seres and Phryni".

The terms Seres and Phryni evidently refers to the Chinese and the peoples of the Tarim basin. Tarn points out that there can be no doubt that the Bactrian nickel, used in coins, came from China.[24] Central Asia may have been brought under the orbit of the Bactrian trade by Euthydemus and Demetrius possibly brought the region under his semi-political control. In the first century B.C when Menander flourished the region of Tarim basin was under the control of the nomads and as the *Shi-ki* and the *T'sien-Han-shu*, the leading authorities on the history of Central Asia in this period, speak nothing about the Greeks it follows that Menander had nothing to do with the region

Patalene, the country of Patala, is the Indus delta. The *Mahaābhārata* refers to Yavanādhīpa Dattamitra in connection with Sauvīra.[24a] A Nasik cave inscription (No. 18) speaks of a Yonaka hailing from Dattamitri.[25] These references prove clearly that the Sauvīra country (the Lower Indus valley) formed a part of the dominion of Dattamitra or Demetrius In conquering the region Demetrius appears to have been influenced more by economic considerations. The Achaemenids had already founded a port at Patala, modern Bahamanabad, and later on Alexander also used it.[26] The empire of Demetrius was hemmed on all sides by two strong political powers and naturally it wanted an outlet which was supplied by the conquest of the Sauvīra country.

There is no direct evidence of Demetrius' connection with Saraostos or Surāṣṭra. The Periplus states that the coins of Apollodotus and Menander were in circulation in its time in the port of Barygaza or Broach.

The identification of Sigerdis is unknown. Tarn thinks that

24 *GBI*, p. 87.

24a A K Narain points out that the text here may be spurious, *IG*, pp 39ff

25 *Ep. Ind.*, viii, p. 90.

26 Chattopadhyaya, *The Achaemenids in India*, Ch. iv

"it can only mean the country between Patalene and Surastrene, including Cutch",[27] and if Saraostos formed a part of the dominion of Demetrius, Sigerdis was also naturally included within the same.

Some scholars think that Euthydemia, identified with Śākala or Sialkot, was the capital of Demetrius in India, and it was named after his father. We have already seen that Śākala was included within the dominion of Pusyamitra where he was killed by Yakṣa Kṛmīśa. If we accept the identification of Kṛmīśa with Demetrius then we have to conclude that Puṣyamitra's reign came to an end before c.171 B.C. for as we shall see later on, Demetrius possibly died in that year. Though the dating goes against the *Purāṇic* chronology, there is still something to be said in its favour.[28] In that case we may assume that Demetrius occupied Śākala after killing Puṣyamitra. Otherwise, we have to assume that Puṣyamitra occupied Śākala after the death of Demetrius (c.171 B C) when the Bactrian empire in India was passing through a great crisis.

The Indian campaigns attributed to Demetrius are, however, credited to Demetrius II by A. K. Narain. Macdonald and Tarn think that Demetrius II was the son of Demetrius I who made conquests in India. The existence of a second Demetrius is affirmed by many numismatists, but they are not unanimous regarding his achievements.

RISE OF EUCRATIDES

Rapson points out that "the princes of the house of Euthydemus who reigned both in Bactria and in kingdoms south of the Hindukush are Demetrius, Pantaleon, Agathocles, and probably also Antimachus".[29] In this list we should include Euthydemus II, who was possibly a son of Demetrius, or his brother, as A. K. Narain thinks. As Demetrius was the last of his house to rule over Bactria, the other princes were possibly sub-kings under him We have already stated

27 *GBI*, p 148
28 *PIHC*, 1954, p. 101ff.
29 *CHI*, p. 546.

that about 171 B.C. one Eucratides occupied the throne of Bactria, while Demetrius was still engaged in his Indian conquest. Demetrius hurried back home, and Justin informs us that he blockaded Eucratides with a force of 60,000 strong. In spite of tremendous difficulties, Eucratides put up a strong resistance and ultimately Demetrius had to withdraw his siege. Eucratides' career thus began amidst difficulties. Justin informs us that he had to fight against the Sogdians. Possibly the Sogdians took up the cause of Demetrius and refused to acknowledge the usurper, or they might have tried to snatch away a portion of the Hellenistic territory.

The '*Zeus enthroned*' type of his coins possibly shows that he was in possession of Kāpiśa. As these are often coins of Apollodotus restruck, it is clear that he snatched away a portion of the Indian empire of the house of Euthydemus. Rapson observes: "The conquest which Eucratides carried beyond the Kabul valley into the region of Eastern Gandhāra (Takṣaśilā) seem to be represented by the coins bearing the type '*Dioscuri*' ...... which was continued by Diomedes.... Whether the type '*Victory*' denotes that Eucratides was at some time in possession of Nicaea on the Jhelum must remain doubtful".[30]

The rise of Eucratides against Demetrius had a very deep significance. Eucratides was a cousin of Antiochus IV, the Syrian king, and when the former invaded Bactria it appeared to be an indirect attempt of the Syrian king to recover a lost province of the empire. The Arsacids of Parthia naturally watched the event with dismay, for they apprehended that their kingdom might also be torn asunder sooner or later in a similar way. But Antiochus IV died suddenly (c.163 B.C.), when his elder brother, the Seleucid Demetrius I, came to the throne. Eucratides refused to acknowledge the new king as a suzerain, while Timarchus, the Seleucid general of the province of Media, also rose in revolt and took the title of the king of Media and Babylon. Timarchus issued coins in imi-

30 *Ibid.*, p. 556.

tation of the tetradrachm of Eucratides[31] and this has been taken as an evidence of an alliance between the two kings. Thus the Seleucidan empire was in confusion, and this gave the Parthian king Mithridates I the opportunity to crush his rival Eucratides. The evidence of the Classical writers and the coins on this point, however, needs a critical consideration.

Strabo states that the Parthians deprived Eucratides of the Bactrian satrapies of Aspionus and Turiva, possibly Aria and Arachosia. We have at least two coins of Mithridates I which are exact copies of Eucratides' *Dioscuri*.[32] Orosius, the Roman historian, informs us that Mithridates I conquered the region between the Indus and the Hydaspes. If this Hydaspes can be identified with the Jhelum, then we may possibly infer that the empire of Eucratides extended beyond the Indus, upto the Jhelum at least. Rapson identifies the river with the Medus Hydaspes of Virgil,[33] and according to this theory then the Indus would form possibly the eastern boundary of the kingdom of Eucratides in India. But we must also consider critically whether we can take this statement of Orosius who flourished about 480 A.D. as sober history, specially when there is no other earlier account corroborating the same.

It is really difficult to determine exactly when Mithridates I conquered the region upto the Indus or the Jhelum. Tarn thinks that Mithridates made an alliance with Demetrius II, one of the four sons of Demetrius and attacked Bactria. "It was Mithridates' attack which recalled Eucratides from India. He may have hurried back with only part of his army; in any case the allies met him and defeated and killed him, and Demetrius II in his hatred refused burial to the corpse".[34] If we accept Tarn's account then we have to infer that Mithridates first attacked Bactria and then after killing Eucratides occupied his Indian territory upto the Indus or the Jhelum.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 457.
32 *GBI*, p. 222. f.n. 2.
33 *CHI*, p. 568.
34 *GBI*, p. 222.

Tarn's theory is based on a statement of Justin which runs to the effect that Eucratides was "killed by a son who was a joint king and who drove the chariot over his body and ordered that his corpse should lay unburied" Tarn identifies the son in question with Demetrius II, son of Demetrius I on the ground that 'Justin does not say a *filio ejus*, but simply a *filio*'.[35] But in the same passage he calls the son '*parricidio*', thus making it quite clear that the '*filio*' was, in fact, a son of Eucratides himself.

Heliocles and the Tribal Inroads

The son of Eucratides who committed this parricide has been identified with Heliocles II, who, if our interpretation of Justin's account be correct, had been a joint king with Eucratides The coins of Agathocleia and Strato I were restruck by Heliocles. This shows that he made some conquests on this side of the Hindukush and deprived the house of Euthydemus a portion of its empire. This event evidently happened after Heliocles had been compelled to leave Bactria under the pressure of the nomads. Thus Strabo informs us that "the best known of the nomad tribes are those who drove the Greeks out of Bactria—the Asii, the Pasiani, the Tochari and the Sacarauli, who came from the country on the other side of the Jaxartes, over against the Sacae and Sogdiani, which country was also in occupation of the Sacae".[37] Trogus, however, simply states that "the Saraucae and the Asiani siezed Bactria and Sogdiana".[38] Trogus' account has often been criticised by some scholars who think that it generally suffers from the combined errors of two persons—Trogus Pompeius and Justin who epitomised the account, plus the copyist's mistake. At many points the account is very compressed, but in this particular case, as pointed out by Debevoise and others, it is more reliable than Strabo's. While there is no doubt

35 Justin as quoted in *GBI*, p. 220 f.n 1.
36 *CHI*, p. 454 ; *GBI*, pp. 196-7
37 Strabo, xl 5. 11
38 Trogus 41-42 ; *CHI*, p. 459

that the Sacarauli is identical with the Saraucae, the Asii. the Pasiani and the Tochari of Strabo appear to be one and the same people and identical with the Asiani of Trogus Trogus informs us that the Asiani were the kings of the Tochari. From this it appears that the Asiani was a tribe of the Tochari clan, just as the Licchavis of India were the ruling tribe of the Vajjian clan of Vaiśālī. Pasiani is evidently a copyist's duplication for Asiani and the identity of the Asii and the Asiani has been recognised long ago

Thus, according to the Classical writers, the inroads of the Śakas (Sacarauli) and the Asiani, identical with the Yueh-chi, caused the downfall of the Greek kingdom of Bactriana. Tarn thinks that "the Saca conquest of Bactria is a myth", and observes: "I have said that Chang-kien is quite clear that the conquest of Ta-hia (Bactria proper) was the work of the Yueh-chi. But almost every modern writer known to me attributes that conquest to the Sacas driven southward by Yueh-chi, who are supposed to have occupied the country until the Yueh-chi expelled or subdued them Chang-kien who was there knows nothing about this, and no scrap of evidence for it exists ; it arose originally from a misunderstanding of a simple passage in Strabo, and for many years one writer just copied it from another, till it has become an obsession ; every form of Saca—Sacaraucae, Sai-wang, even Tochari—has been pressed into service, and the theories to which this belief has given rise have done more than anything else to obscure the history of this time. Certainly, Strabo says that the Sacas occupied Bactria but the most cursory perusal of the context shows that throughout the whole section, he is talking, not of the second century B.C., but of a time long before that—he calls it Achaemenid, but it was really the seventh century—the time of the great Saca invasion, well-known from Assyrian sources, which had played its part in the fall of Nineveh and had penetrated as far as Armenia and Cappadocian Pontus"[39]

39 *GBI*, p. 283

The passage of Strabo, of which Tarn speaks of so much. is indeed confused one. It is difficult to agree with the view that Bactria was conquered by a mixed horde of the Śaka and the Yueh-chi.[40] As pointed out by McGovern, it is absolutely clear from the Chinese annals that the Yueh-chi occupied Ta-hia (Bactria) at a later period, after it has been conquered by the Śakas. We shall discuss later on the history of the tribal movement in Central Asia (*intra,* Chap. III), and here we only want to point to the fact that the Indian evidences prove the connection of the Śakas with Bactria. According to a Kanheri inscription the daughter of the mahākṣatrapa Rudra claimed descent from the Kārdamaka family. Rapson points out that the name Kārdamaka is evidently derived from the Kārdama river (Ẕarapsan), which is in the Persian satrapy of Bactria. The *Uttara Kāṇda* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* connects a line of Kārdama kings with Bāhlīka (Bactria).[41] This shows that a branch of the Śakas who came and ruled in India in the second century A D hailed originally from Bactria—a fact which goes against Tarn's theory.

The Pedegree Coins or Medallions

It has already been stated that Demetrius had probably under him sub-kings like Pantaleon, Agathocles and probably also Antimachus. The medallions issued by these sub-kings make very interesting study. The medallions issued by Agathocles (commonly regarded as pedegree coins or medallions) bear the names of previous rulers such as Alexander the Great, Antiochus Nicator, Diodotus, Euthydemus I and Demetrius with legends as *Alexandrou tou Phillipou* (of Alexander, the son of Phillip) *Antiochou Nīkātoros* (of Antiochus the conqueror, presumably referring to Antiochus II whose usual title was 'Theos'), *Diodotou Soteros* (of Diodotus the Saviour), *Enthydemou Theou* (of Euthydemus the Divine) and *Demetriou Aniketou* (of Demetrius the Unconquered) We have

40 *SPIH,* p 41ff , *JAOS,* 1941, p 223-50.
41 *PHAI,* p 437, f n 2

similar medallions issued by Antimachus which bear only the busts and devices of Euthydemus and Diodotus. The question naturally arises, what might have been the purpose of such issues since we know that they had no connection with Alexander the Great, Antiochus Nicotor or Diodotus? As it has been suggested these are nothing but *political manifestos* against the family of Eucratides with which Demetrius came to arms. They were nothing but attempts to win oven the active support of the Greek citizens of Bactria to whom a descent from Alexander really meant something. The struggle between the two houses is also reflected in the coins of the house of Eucratides. Heliocles issued coins having the figure of Laodice with a diadem and Heliocles with a bare head pointing out, according to Tarn the connection of the king with the Seleuclid line. This was evidently a countermeasure against the pedegree coins of the house of Euthydemus These coins have, however, been differently interpreted. Cunningham and Gardner think that these were issued by Eucratides while Heliocles and Laodice were his parents. Von Sallet opines that they were issued to commemorate the marriage of his son and daughter-in-law. While no final interpretation is possible it shows at any rate the trace of antagonism between the two rival Greek houses, specially if we accept the view that Laodice was a Seleucid princess, for thus Eucratides wanted to enhance the prestige of his house by claiming an old aristocratic and royal connection (*cf.* Tarn, *GBI*, pp. 446ff).

Plato

Before we conclude our account of the Greco-Bactrian kings, we may note the coins of Plato whose history is rather obscure. His coin-types connect him with the Eucratides group A. K. Narain thinks that he was a son of Eucratides on the ground that "the head (on coins) closely resembles the helmeted head of Eucratides I, and the facial features of the bareheaded bust on one of his new coins are very strikingly

similar to the facial type of Heliocles I" (*IG*, pp. 71-2). In any case, 'his kingdom was either very small, or ephemeral, or both' (*GBI*, p. 210). The theory that his coins bear the date 147 of the Seleucid era, *i.e.*, 165 B.C. must now be given up (*IG*, p. 71). It is not unlikely that he was a sub-king under, while his brother a joint king with, Eucratides.

CHAPTER II

THE AGE OF POLITICAL DISINTEGRATION

I

THE RISE OF NEW STATES

VIDIŚĀ, PAÑCĀLA, KAUŚĀMBĪ

About the middle of the second century B.C. the history of North India entered into a new phase. Puṣyamitra was dead (c.151 8.4.), and there is no evidence that his empire survived him. North India became divided into a number of petty states, while the descendants of Puṣyamitra remained contented with a kingdom in and around Vidiśā In the *Cambridge History of India* (Vol. I, p. 627), Rapson holds that "in the present state of Indian archæology it seems impossible to trace the extension of the rule of those kings of Vidiśā who reigned after Puṣyamitra beyond the region in which the Jumna and the Ganges meet, *i e.*, the ancient kingdom of the Vatsas (Kauśāmbī) and the present district of Allahabad". A critical study of the evidences, however, show that this empire of Vidiśā was hardly such extensive one. Rapson has chiefly depended for his inference on the evidence of the Pabhosa inscriptions. The first of them (Luders, no 904) records the excavation of a cave by Āsādhasena, the son of Gopālī Vaihidarī and maternal uncle of rājan Bahasatimita, for the Kasyapiya arhats, in the tenth year of the reign of Udāka. The second one (no. 905) carries the genealogy of Āsāḍhasena further and describes him as "the son of Vaihidarī and of rājan Bhāgavata, the son of Tevanī, the son of Vamgapāla, the son of Sonakāyana, rājan of Adhichatra". Bahasatimita's coins have been found in Kosam. Now, following Jayaswal, Rapson identifies Udāka with Odraka, the fifth king of the Purāṇic list of the Śungas, and thus concludes that he Śuṅga empire at this time extended from the Pañcāla capital of Ahicchatra, in the Bareilly District of

the U.P. to Kosam on the Jumna in the Allahabad District, and had under it at least two subordinato dynasties, one ruling at Ahicchatra and another at Kauśāmbī.

The palaeography of the Pabhosa records goes clearly against any such interpretation. The *angular* forms of the letters and also the *serif*, the developed sign of medial *i*, the curved base of *n* and the developed medial *u* show their affinities with the inscriptions of the Śakas of Mathurā, and hence, the record can hardly be pushed back earlier than the last quarter of the first century B.C., while according to the chronology of the Purāṇas, Odraka ruled in the middle of the second century B.C Thus the theory of Jayaswal falls through altogether. The combined testimony of the Pabhosa records and the coins shows that Pañcāla and Kauśāmbī were two independent kingdoms that arose on the ashes of the empire of Puṣyamitra.[1]

1 There has been a great controversy whether the kings known from Pañcāla, Kauśāmbī and other tribal coins should be regarded as belonging to the dynasty of the Śungas. Carlleyle and Rivett-Carnac were the pioneers who identified the Mitra kings of the coins with the Śuṅgas. (*JASB*, xlix, p. 21ff, p 87ff). Jayaswal (*JBORS*, iii, p. 476ff; xx, p. 279ff). Dr. Raychaudhuri (*PHAI*, p. 392) and de la Valle-Poussin (*L'Inde* etc. pp. 175-6) also favour such a view. On the other hand, Cunningham (*Coins of Ancient India*, pp. 79-80), Allan and others think that the dynasties of Pañcāla etc. had no connection with the so-called Śunga dynasty of the Purānas. While dealing with the coins of Pāñcāla, Smith calls the issuers of these coins "lords of North Pañcāla and Kośala". We are also not in favour of regarding these kings as belonging to the Śuṅga dynasty for, coins bearing names like Agnimitra etc have never been found in the Vidiśā region which became the capital of the so-called Śungas after the death of Puṣyamitra. Even Carlleyle and Rivett-Carnac regard, on the grounds of palæography and style, Agnimitra of the Pañcāla series much later than Agnimitra, the son of Puṣymitra Allan thinks that the Pañcāla dynasty was in existence even before the Śuṅgas (*Catalogue*, cxxi) As Puṣyamitra's dominion, however, extended in the west up to the Punjab (*supra*, p. 12), it is better to think that the Pañcāla dynasty came into existence, after the death of Pusyamitra Similarly, the kings who ruled in Kosam, belonged to a dynasty entirely different from the Śungas For the Kauśāmbī coins, *Catalogue*, 148ff.

Mathurā

Rapson thinks that *Mathurā* was the seat of a royal line subordinate under the Śuṅgas (*loc. cit.*, p. 526). But here one stands on very uncertain grounds. A Mathurā inscription (Lüders, no. 125) refers to the dedication of one Dhanabhūti, the son of Vātsī, while the same person is mentioned in the Bharhut inscription referring to the reign of the Śuṅgas.[2] Now, both at Mathurā, "*the city of the gods*", and at Bharhut people from different parts of India used to go and make dedications, and the same practice we find at a later period in Nālandā. From this we can hardly infer that Mathurā, Bharhut or Nālandā was under the sway of a particular donor. The specific mention of the rule of the Śuṅgas in the Bharhut inscription shows that the region was under their rule, but as the same donor is silent regarding his overlord in his dedication at Mathurā, it shows that the latter place had no connection with the Suṅgas.

Allan in his *Catalogue* divides the *early* coins of Mathurā belonging to the second and first centuries B C. into *two* distinct groups. In one group he has given the coins of Brahmamitra, Dṛdhamitra, Sūryamitra Viṣṇumitra, Puruṣadatta, Uttamadatta and Rāmadatta. In the *second* group, he places the kings who bear the title of rājan; Rāmadatta II, Kāmadatta, Śeṣadatta, Bhavadatta, Uttamadatta and Balabhūti.[3] We think that the kings of *Group II* ruled earlier than the kings of *Group I*, for, the coins of Balabhūti is associated by the style and type with the coinage of Bahasatimita, who as we shall see later on, ruled in the first century B.C, while the coins of Brahmamitra, Dṛḍhamitra, Sūryamitra and Visṇumitra are identical in type with the coins of Gomitra, whose rule was supplanted by the Śakas in Mathurā in the first century A.D.

2 *Select Ins.*, p. 90.

3 Allan, *Catalogue*, cx. "The coins of the Hindu kings of Mathurā cover the period from the beginning of the second century to the middle of the first century B C. " *Ibid.*, cxvi).

YAUDHEYAS AND ĀRJUNĀYANAS

Coins bear further testimony to the fact that in the plains and the mountain fringe of the Punjab there arose several independent states, some republican and some monarchical The most notable among these were the Yaudheyas and the Ārjunāyanas. On the coins dated in the late second—first century B.C. we can read the word *Yaudheyānāṃ*,[4] while on some coins of the first century B C, there is the legend *Mahārājasa*, 'Of the Mahārāja', showing "that the Yaudheyas had a monarchical constitution until a fairly late date".[5] Close to the Yaudheyas, were the Ārjunāyanas lying "within the triangle Delhi — Jaipur — Agra"[6] and their coins bearing the legend *Ārjunāyānāṃ jaya* have been assigned to the second century B.C.[7] It is difficult to determine the exact significance of the legend but it possibly signifies that they achieved independence after hard fight. At a later period the Yaudheyas also issued similar coins.

AUDUMBARAS AND KUNINDAS

Of the Himalayan states two deserve our special attention—the Audumbaras and the Kuṇindas. The coinage of the Audumbaras copy the types of Demetrius and Apollodotus I and this may indirectly prove that they became independent immediately after the death of Puṣyamitra. Four kings are known from the coins and one of them Mahādeva takes the title of '*king of kings*', used possibly for first time by an indigenous sovereign.[8] The Kuṅindas rose in the first century B.C. possibly under their king Amoghabhūti. "Economically the silver coins of the Kunindas represent an attempt of an Indian ruler to issue a native silver coinage which would compete in the

4 *Ibid.*, p. 267.
5 *Ibid.*, cxlvii.
6 *Ibid.*, lxxxiii.
7 *Ibid.*,
8 For the Audumbaras, J. Przyluski. *JA*, 1926, 1ff. The Audumbaras occupied the Gurdaspur and the Hosiarpur Districts, and manufactured a fine cotton cloth, Kotumbara.

market with the later Indo-Greek silver. It is probable that Amoghabhūti's political history was similar. He was probably an Indian chief who founded a short-lived kingdom at the close of the periods of Greek dominion in the Punjab in the last half of the first century B.C which was soon swept away by the Śaka and Kuṣāṇa invaders."[9] Ptolemy in his *Geographikẹ* speaks of the country of *Kulindrene* in which the rivers Beas, Sutlej and the Jumna rise, showing that the tribe occupied the region at the foot of the Siwalik hills and the adjoining territories.[10]

KOSALA

The Ayodhyā inscription of Dhanadeva evidently shows that after the death of Puṣyamitra his governors declared independence Thus while Dhanadeva describes himself as the sixth in descent from Puṣyamitra and also as Kośalādhīpa, and also as coins of various rulers have been discovered in Ayodhyā pointing to their independent status and evidently an independent dynasty, it may be inferred that originally Ayodhyā was a province in the empire of Puṣyamitra, but later on became independent. Similar also may have been the case with other provinces of the empire.[11]

THE POSITION OF THE ŚUNGAS

From the above discussion it is thus quite clear that there was no empire of the Śuṅgas. after the death of Puṣyamitra

9 Allan, *Catalogue*, cxif

10 Ptolemy has possibly made the country of the Kunindas too large in the hill tracts. Their coins have been found in Upper Eastern Punjab and in Saharanpur as well. In the literature, the name of the tribe generally appears as Kulinda. On the interchange of *n* and *l*, see Levi, *IA*, 1915, p. 101.

11 In the Ayodhyā inscription, Dhanadeva describes himself as '*Puṣyamitraṣya ṣaṣtha*' (*Select Ins.*, 96) The expression evidently means "sixth in descent from Pusyamitra either from the side of the father or that of the mother The interpretation is supported by the palæography of the record. Sanskrit usage would require Puṣyamitrāt; but the language of the record is influenced by Prākrit The interpretation 'sixth brother of Puṣyamitra' is out of the question."

and it is, therefore, *a misnomer to think of a Śuṅga age in ancient Indian history.* North India was, in fact, studded with various petty local states[12] without any political cohesion. Some scholars point to a few similarities between the names of kings occurring in the Śuṅga-Kāṇva list of the Purāṇas and those occurring on the tribal coins of the period and conclude that a North Indian empire was in existence even after the time of the early Śuṅga kings. We may here note what Allan has very appropriately stated on the subject: "Attempts have from time to time been made to identify rulers of this (Pañcāla) dynasty with names in the Purānic lists of the Śuṅga dynasty, but without success. The only name found in both lists is Agnimitra, which is too common a name for any deduction to be made from it. Sujyesṭha or Vasujyesṭha has been identified with Jyeṣṭhamitra (Jeṭhamitra), but the latter has no connection with the Pañcāla series, even if we accept the possibility of this contraction. Bhadraghoṣa is identified with Ghoṣa of the Purānic list, which is very unlikely. Bhūmitra is identified with the Kāṇva king of the same name, but his coins cannot be removed from the middle of the Pañcāla series, while the Kāṇva was the second of the successors of the Śuṅgas".[13]

As Rapson has stated there is no evidence to show that the successors of Puṣyamitra were in any way connected with the royal city of Pāṭaliputra; on the contrary, they appear to

12 The evidence of the existence of these local states is furnished by the coins: see *Catalogues* of Cunningham and Allan.

13 Allan, *Catalogue*, cxx, Rapson says : "Whether the Agnimitra, whose coins are found in North Pañcāla and who was therefore presumably king of Ahicchatra, can be identified with the Śuṅga king of that name is uncertain" (*CHI*. p. 520). *contra* : de la Valle Poussin, L'Inde etc. p 174ff; *PHAI*, p 392 " .... We should remember that 'Mitra' coins, even those which undoubtedly belong to the so-called Pañchāla series .... were a local dynasty of North Pañchāla" As the coins are often carried from one place to another. we can only draw the inference of "*provenance*" from the find of a hoard A stray coin found in a place can hardly justify that the rulers mentioned therein held sway over the region where it has been found

have been confined in the Vidiśā or Bhilsa region. This is proved in the first place by the evidence of the Bharhut Pillar inscription referring to "*Suganam raje*", and also indirectly by the account of the Besnagar Garuḍa Pillar inscription of the time of Bhāgabhadra. The inscription records the erection of the Garuḍa Pillar in honour of Lord Viṣṇu, by one Heliodoros who was sent as an ambassador by king Antialkidas of Taxila, to the court of the king Kautśiputra Bhāgabhadra who has been identified with the fifth Śuṅga king Bhadraka. Had Bhadraka been living in Pāṭaliputra, there is no reason why the Taxila ambassador would go to the Gwalior region on his way. This evidently points to the fact that the capital of the fifth Śunga king was near by, and this finds corroboration from the Bharhut inscription referred to above.

The facts thus appear to have been something like this. Puṣyamitra was an imperial figure residing at Pāṭaliputra but his successors were reduced to the position of a petty local dynasty at Vidiśā. The Purāṇas were giving simply the account of dynasty without any reference to its kingdom and capital, and so the narrative was continued after Puṣyamitra. The Kāṇvas also ruled in the same region after the Śuṅgas and so they also found a place in the Purāṇic account, and as the Satavāhanas captured the same region their names also have been recorded in the sacred lore. This shows that upto the time of Puṣyamitra, the Purāṇas describe the royal dynasties from the point of view of Pātaliputra. but after his time the angle of vision shifted to the Madhya-Bhārat.

The dynasty list of the Śuṅga kings in the Purāṇas is as follows:

1.	Puṣyamitra	..	36 or 60 years
2.	Agnimitra	...	8 "
3.	Vasujyeṣṭha (Sujyeṣṭha)	..	7 "
4.	Vasumitra (Sumitra)	...	10 "
5.	Odraka (Andhraka etc)	...	2 or 7 "
6.	Pulindaka	...	3 "
7.	Ghoṣa	...	3 "

8.	Vajramitra	...	9 or 7 years
9	Bhāga (Bhāgavata)	..	32 "
10.	Devabhūti	...	10 "

II

THE LATER ŚUNGAS AND THE KĀṆAS

Agnimitra must have succeeded his father Puṣyamitra at an advanced age inasmuch as the *Mālavikāgnimitram* represents his son Vasumitra sufficiently grown up to be in charge of the sacrificial horse while he was still a viceroy at Vidiśā. The Purāṇas may, therefore, be correct in assigning to him a short reign of eight years only.

Nothing is known, about the third king *Vasujyeṣṭha* who may have been the eldest son of Agnimitra and was succeeded ultimately by his younger brother Vasumitra The Purāṇas are evidently wrong in making Vasumitra the son of Vasujyeṣṭha, for according to the *Mālavikāgnimitram*, as we have already seen, he was the son of Agnimitra and was deputed by his grandfather Pusyamitra in charge of the sacrificial horse. Of him, the *Harṣacarita* states · "Sumitra, son of Agnimitra, being over fond of the drama, was attacked by Mitradeva in the midst of actors and with a scimitar shorn, like a lotus stalk, of his head".[14] Rapson observes in this connection : "Who Mitradeva was we can only conjecture ; but it seems not improbable that he may have been the king's minister and a Kāṇva Brāhmaṇa of the same family as Vāsudeva, who is said to have brought about the fall of the dynasty through the assassination of the last king Devabhūti. It may be that we have here an indication of the growth of that influence, which so often in Indian history has transferred the real power in the state from the prince to the minister, from the Kṣatriya to the Brāhmaṇa".[15]

In different Mss. of the Purāṇas the name of the next king appears variouslv as Andhraka, Bhadraka, Ārdraka, Antaka,.

14 *HC*, trans., p. 192.
15 *CHI*, p. 521.

Odraka etc Jayaswal identifies him with king Udāka mentioned in the Pabhosa inscription, but, as we have already stated, the theory can hardly be accepted (*supra*, pp. 23-4). Some scholars think he should be identified with king Bhāgabhadra mentioned in the Besnagar inscription of Heliodoros in the fourteenth year of whose reign the Yavana ambassador installed a Garuda Pillar at Vidiśā, Besnagar (*supra*, p. 29). Rapson proposes to identify Bhāgabhadra with the ninth Śunga king Bhāgavata, who, according to the Purāṇas, ruled for 32 years.[16] Rapson's theory has been criticised on the ground that in Bhilsa we have got another inscription belonging to the twelfth year of the reign of king Bhāgavata, and "it is incredible that a king who is called Bhāgavata in an inscription of the twelfth year of his reign could be designated by radically a different name like Bhāgabhadra two years later in an inscription on a pillar installed in the same city".[17] The argument has got certainly some force, and, on the face of it, it seems better that Bhāgabhadra should be identified with the fifth Śuṅga king, and it should be assumed further that the Purāṇas are wrong in assigning to him a short period of two or seven years, when the Besnagar record states he ruled for 14 years at least.

The tenth or the last king of the line Devabhūti or Devabhūmji was murdered by his minister Vāsudeva who founded the Kānva line of kings Thus the *Harṣacarita* states: "In a frenzy of passion the over-libidinous Śunga was at the instance of his minister Vāsudeva reft of his life by a daughter of Devabhūti's slave woman (dāsī) disguised as his queen[18]

With the murder of Devabhūti the main Śuṅga line ruling at Vidiśā came to an end There are some statements in the *Purāṇas*, however, that have caused confusions. Thus it is stated: "The minister Vāsudeva, forcibly overthrowing the

16 *Ibid*, p. 521.
17 *IHQ*, v, p 610
18 *HC*, trans., p. 193.

dissolute king Devabhūmi, because of his youth, will become king among the Śungas (or will become the Śuṅga king)." Again, it is stated: "The Āndhra Śiśuka (or Sindhuka) with his fellow tribesmen, the servants of Suśarman, will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and him (Suśarman, the last Kāṇva king), and destroy the remains of the Śuṅga's power and will obtain the earth".[19]

From the above accounts, R. P. Chanda has inferred that Devabhūmi or Devabhūti, ruler of Magadha, was a nominal head of the Śunga federation, and Vāsudeva Kāṇva usurped that position by assassinating him, but probably did not interfere with the other Śuṅga principalities.[20] We have already stated that the successors of Puṣyamitra had no connection with the Magadha country, and, it is further hard to believe that there was any Śuṅga federation of which these kings were the heads. The Purāṇic account simply shows that when Vāsudeva became king or the Andhra Śiśuka or Śimuka overthrew the last Kānva king, there were other principalities ruled by the scions of the Śuṅga family, as we have stated before.

In the *Cambridge History of India*, Vol. I. p. 522 and also in the *Early History of the Deccan*, Ch. vi by R. G. Bhandarkar, it has been held that the Śuṅgas and the Kāṇvas for sometimes ruled contemporaneously, and it has been held by Bhandarkar further that "the 112 years that tradition assigns to the Śuṅgas include the 45 assigned to the Kāṇvas". There is hardly any reason for such a theory when the Purāṇas assign 45 years to the Kāṇvas after 112 years of the Śuṅgas. The Kānvas were contemporary not of the ten Śuṅga kings who ruled for 112 years, according to the *Purāṇas*, but of others (the rulers of neighbouring states that arose after the fall of Puṣyamitra and survived the rule of the ten Śuṅga kings as proved by the evidence of the coins)

19 Pargiter, *DKA*.
20 *IHQ*, v p 612

The *Purāṇas* speak of the following Kānva kings:

1	Vāsudeva	9 years
2	Bhūmitra	14 "
3.	Nārāyaṇa	12 "
4.	Suśarman	10 "

III

INVASIONS FROM SOUTH

Sātavāhana Invasion

The political condition of North India was thus a highly confused one in the first century B.C. and it naturally fell an easy prey to the invaders from South India. According to the *Purāṇas,* Śiśuka or Śimuka put an end to the rule of the last Kāṇva king, and the Malwa region apparently passed under the rule of the Sātavāhanas. An inscription on the southern gateway of the Stūpa I of Sanchi records "the gift of Ānamda, son of Vāsithī (Vāśiṣṭhī), and the superintendent of the workshop of king Siri-Sātakani". Siri-Sātakani has been identified with king Śrī Sātakarṇī, the third monarch of the Āndhra-Sātavāhana dynasty. As Sanchi was a place of pilgrimage, the inscription alone cannot prove the dominance of the Sātavāhana over the Malwa region, but when studied in the background of the *Purāṇic* account, the record appears to have some value from the point of view of political history. According to the *Purāṇic* chronology the Kāṇva rule came to an end c.30 B.C. which would consequently be a date during the reign of Śimuka, and thus Sātakarnī would rule at the end of the first century B.C. or the beginning of the first century A.D.[21]

21 There is some controversy regarding the period when the Sātavāhanas came to power. A group of scholars maintain that the dynasty arose at the end of the third century B.C. contemporaneously with the Suṅgas. According to the Purāṇas, however, Śimuka, the first king of the Sātavāhana dynasty, was a contemporary of Suśarman, the last Kānva king whose rule came to an end in c 30 B C If Sāta-

INVASION OF KHĀRAVELA

The Hathigumpha inscription of king Khāravela proves that about this time the Kaliṅga king also invaded North India. The date of the record has been a moot question and a considerable literature has grown up on the subject. Fortunately now the problem appears to be an almost solved one As Dr. Sircar has stated "the angular form and straight bases of letters like *b*, m, *p*, *h*, and *y*, which are usually found in the Hathigumpha record suggest a date not much earlier than the beginning of the first century A.D On grounds of palæography, it is to be placed later probably than the Nanaghat records and certainly than the Besnagar inscription of Heliodoros ... It is interesting in this connection to note that authorities on Indian art believe that the sculptures of the Mañchapuri cave (in which there is an inscription of Khāravela's queen) 'are considerably posterior to the sculptures of Bharhut'."[22] Further, as in l. 4 of the record, Khāravela claims Sātakarnī, identified with the Sātavāhana king Sātakarnī I, as one of his contemporaries, we may assign the record to the period with which we are dealing here. We are furnished with the following details regarding the achievements of the king in North India ·

(a) "In the eighth year of his reign, with a large army .. ...having stormed the *Gorathagiri*, he tormented *Rājagṛha*; by the (very) sound of his achievements, the *Yavana-rāja Di(mita)* fled with his army to Mathurā......".

karnī mentioned in the Hathigumpha record be identified with Sātakarṇī I then the Purāṇic account appears to be correct. For the meaning of the term Sātakarṇī, Sātavāhana etc., see de la Vallée-Poussin. *L'Inde* etc. p 206ff.

22 B. M. Barua, *Old Brāhmī Inscriptions*, no. 1; *IHQ*, xiv. p. 261ff · K. P Jayaswal and R D Banerjee, *Ep. Ind*, xx p. 72f; Buhler, *Indian Studies*, iii. p. 13, Fleet *JRAS*, 1910, p. 242ff; p. 824; Lüders. *List*, no. 1345; K P. Jayaswal. *JBORS*, iii p. 425ff; iv. p. 364f; xiii. p 221ff; xiv. p 150ff; Sten Konow, *Acta Orientalia*, i. p 12ff; F W Thomas, JRAS, 1922, p. 83f.

(b) "In the twelfth year of his reign. ... with an army of thousand strong he frightened the kings of Uttarāpatha (*Utarāpatha rājānō*) . . causing great fear in the mind of the people of *Magadha* he made descend the elephants and the horses in the Ganges, he compelled *Vahasatimita* and (the king of) Magadha (*Māgadham ca rājānaṃ Bahasatimitam*), to adore his feet.... brought treasures from Anga- and Magadha".

The exact interpretation of the account given above is, indeed, very difficult, as the record is in a very bad state of preservation, and, secondly, as we have no other record to corroborate and elucidate the cryptic statements It appears that in the eighth year of his reign Khāravela came to Rajgir, Dist Patna, Bihar, but as nothing is said of the king we may possibly infer that the ruler of the place was either a very petty monarch or there prevailed a republican form of government at the time. A clay seal obtained at Gaya bears in Maurya characters the legend *Mokhalinam*, "of the Maukharis" showing that the clan held some sway over the region [23] As it refers to the clan in general, we may possibly infer that it shows the existence of the Maukhari republic. Dr. Barua has brought to our notice some inscriptions from Bodh-Gaya mentioning the names of kings Indrāgnimitra and Brahmamitra and concludes that they held sway about this time over the Magadha region [24] But as we have stated before, inscriptions from sacred places like Bodh-Gaya and others can hardly throw any light on the dominion of a particular king mentioned in the epigraphs, for outsiders also used to flock there and made dedications. The case appears to be particularly so when we find in Bodh-Gaya the record of a gift by Bodhirakṣita, "the Tāmraparnika—a man belonging to Tāmraparnī". Indrāgnimitra and Brahmamitra might have ruled at Pāṭaliputra, since

23 *Fleet, Corpus* III p. 14
24 *IHQ*, vi p 7f.

the king of Magadha is referred to in the inscription of Khāravela.

The second part of the statement is very interesting and intriguing. It shows that a Greek king had advanced as far as Magadha, and made a retreat being afraid of Khāravela. Konow reads the name as Dimita and identifies him with Demetrius I which is, however, impossible in view of the date of the record. Chanda thinks that he may have been a refugee from Mathura who was compelled to leave his kingdom when the country was occupied by the Scythians. In any case, it shows that in the last decade of the first century B.C. there was a fresh Yavana inroad into the Gangetic valley, and this Dimita may be identified with Timitra mentioned in a Besnagar seal[25] If the seal had not been carried to the place from outside, and this appears to be the case, it shows that the Besnagar region passed under the Yavana domination. The seal is a very interesting one and reads as follows:

Timitra —datrisya (sa)—ho(tā) —
p(o)tā-mamtra — sajana(? i)

Dr. Bhandarkar makes the following observations on the above seal: "The meaning of this legend, as just remarked, is not quite clear, but the words *hotā, potā* and *Maṃtra,* which are technical to sacrificial literature, indicate that the sealing is really connected with the Yajñaśālā. And the import of the legend appears to be : 'Of the donor Timitra accompanied by Hotā, Potā hymn-kinsmen... . '".[26]

KINGS SARVATATA AND BAHASTIMITA

In this connection we may note that a Ghosundi (near Nagari, Chitorgadḥ District, Rajasthan) inscription[27] written in Brāhmī characters of *circa* second half of the first century B. C. refers to king Sarvatāta who performed an Aśvamedha sacri-

25 Some scholars think that Timitra of the Besnagar seal is identical with Demetrius I, but the palæography of the epigraph is clearly against such an early date

26 *ASI*, 1914-15, p 77

27 *Select Ins* p 91

fice Some scholars think that Sarvatāta was a Kāṇva king, but as his name is not mentioned in the Purāṇic list, it is more probable that he was a lical ruler who possibly took part in defeating the Yavana Timitra and later on performed the horse-sacrifice as a mark of his victory.

In the twelfth year of his reign, Khāravela is said to have frightened Utarāpatha rājāno ... *i e*, the kings of the Uttarāpatha (accusative-plural), showing again that North India was divided into a number of petty principalities without any supreme overlord. The expression *Māgadham ca Rājānam Bahasatimitaṃ* causes some difficulty. The *ca* between *Māgadham* and *Rājānam Bahasatimitam* seems to show that the Māgadha king was a different person from Bahasatimita. If, however, we regard *ca* as redundant then Bahasatimita may be regarded as the king of Magadha. Dr Barua thinks that he was the immediate successor of king Brahmamitra mentioned in the Bodh-Gaya inscriptions. We have already seen that Bahasatimita is mentioned in a Pabhosa inscription, while there is another record from Mora, Mathura, recording the gift of his daughter.[28] As the Pabhosa record is dated in the tenth year of the reign of Udāka who was evidently a king of the Kosam region we may possibly infer that for some time at least Bahasatimita was a subordinate ruler. Later on, however, he became independent as the evidence of his coins and the inscription of Khāravela shows It is also not unlikely that while Bahasatimita was ruling in Magadha, Udāka had been ruling in Kosam, and as the record was incised in the latter's territory he has found a prominent mention. Allan thinks that there was one Bahasatimita I who ruled "not later than the first half of the second century B. C., and might even be as early as the third century",[29] and another Bahasatimita II who ruled at the end of the second century B.C. or first century B.C. Allan further thinks that while the Pabhosa record may be assigned to Bahasatimita II, the Mora inscription belongs to Bahasati-

28 *Supra*, p 24, JRAS 1912, p 120
29 Allan. *Catalogue*, xcvi.

mita I. We are, however, inclined to think that both the Bahasatimitas were one and the same person and the fine distinction between the Aśokan and the so-called Śuṅga character of the scripts need not be stressed too much. If Bahasatimita was the king of Magadha, then the discovery of his coins in the Kosam region may be explained by the supposition that they had been carried thither by the traders.

IV

THE INDO-GREEK KINGS

While thus the heart of North India was being parcelled into a number of petty states since the middle of the second century B.C., the Punjab and the North-Western Frontier Province had been faring no better. We have already seen that under the pressure of the nomads the Greek rule came to an end in Bactria. Heliocles moved to the south of the Hindukush region. (*supra,* p. 19 f). Thus henceforth we have two houses of the Yavanas in India proper often at rivalry and war. As Rapson says: "No connected account of these two rival Yavana houses has been preserved; and practically nothing is known about the personal character or achievements of the leaders who directed the affairs of a period which must have been full of stirring events. A few isolated references in literature, Greek, Roman and Indian, a single Indian inscription, and the coin legends of about thirty Greek kings and two Greek queens supply the evidence which enables us to retrace very imperfectly a few outlines in the history of the successors of Alexander the Great in India during the second and first centuries B.C."[30] Since Rapson wrote in 1922, the discovery of the Shinkot inscription[31] has necessitated a little change in his scheme, which, otherwise, is a monumental contribution in the field of Indology.

30 *CHI,* p 541.
31 *Ep. Ind.* xxiv. p. 7.

Rapson's account, which has also been mainly followed by Tarn and others, may thus be summarised:

(a) The house of Euthydemus ruled mainly in the Eastern Punjab till it was supplanted by Azes I in c.58 B C. To this house belonged Demetrius II, Menander, Strato I, Strato II, Apollodotus II, Dionysius, Apollophanes, Zoilus, Nicias, Hippostratus, etc.

(b) The house of Eucratides ruled in the region to the west of the river Jhelum.

(i) in Puṣkalāvatī after the reign of Heliocles ruled— Diomedes, Epander, Philoxenus, Artemidorus and Peucolaus;

(ii) in Takṣaśilā after the reign of Antialkidas, ruled Archebius;

(iii) in the Upper Kabul valley, after the reign of Antialkidas, ruled Amyntus and Hermaues.

Maues wrested from the Yavanas Puṣkalāvatī after the reign of Artemidorus, and Takṣasilā after the reign of Archebius about 75 B. C. The Yavana rule in the Upper Kabul valley came to an end under the pressure of Spalirises, the brother of Vonones about 25 B.C.

It is quite clear that here we are dealing with one of the most confused chapters of ancient Indian history. At the outset emphasis should be given on the following facts: *viz.*, that Demetrius and Menander were not contemporaries, as already shown before; *secondly*, that the *Śakas* occupied Taxila at the end of the first century B C., as it will be shown in the next chapter, and hence the Greek rule continued at least upto that period; and, *thirdly*, the Greek kingdom in the Kabul valley possibly continued till the time of Gondopharnes (*vide*, Chap. III, *infra*)

When we find that about thirty rulers have to be placed within a period of less than 170 years (Demetrius-Eucratides to

the advent of the Śakas in the Punjab), we have naturally to assume that many of them either were sub-kings or ruled contemporaneously over different small kingdoms. But as we have no definite source throwing light on the point, the history of the period must remain dark to a great extent.

STRATO I AND STRATO II

We have already seen that Heliocles restruck the coins of Agathoclea and Strato I of the house of Euthydemus, and hence they must be regarded as contemporaries. Rapson, Tarn and others think that Agathoclea was the daughter of Demetrius and wife of Menander.[32] This theory can no longer be maintained as Menander possibly flourished in the first century B.C. (*supra*, p. 7). Strato I, later on, issued coins in his own name, and still later on in association with his grandson, Strato II Philophator.[33] Though it is difficult to determine who was the immediate predecessor of Strato I the evidence of coins shows that he became the ruler not long after Demetrius I. The nomads occupied Bactria about 145 B.C which compelled Heliocles to move to the south of the Hindukush[34] It may thus be inferred that in 145 B.C. Strato I was a minor and Agathoclea had been acting as the regent. As on his later coins he is represented "with toothless jaws and sunken cheeks", Rapson has inferred that he possibly lived for more than 70 years.[35] If we are permitted to assume that in c.145 B C. Strato I was 15 years old then we can possibly infer that his reign came to an end c. 90 B.C. The debasted art of the latest coins of Strato I shows that the empire must have been passing through some crisis which was evidently caused by the attacks of the rival house. As the coins of

32 *CHI*, p 552, and specially f n 1, Tarn thinks that Menander who was a commoner "legitimatised his rule by marrying Demetrius' daughter Agathoclea, the evidence that she was his queen seems conclusive" (*GBI*, p 225)

33 *CHI*, p 553, Rapson, *Corolla Numismatica*, 1906, p 245ff.

34 Cf *JIH*, xii 19; *contra*, *SPIH*, ch I The date 145 B C tallies with other evidences

35 *CHI*, p 553

Apollodotus II Philophator, Dionysius and Zoilus bear common monogram with those of Strato,[36] they appear to have been sub-kings under the latter. Another such sub-king may have been Apollophanes.

ANTIALKIDAS

The critical stage through which the kingdom of Strato I had been passing in the later years was evidently caused by the rise of Antialkidas, of the house of Eucratides, for whose reign fortunately we have an important inscription from Besnagar, referred to above The record states that the column with the figure of Garuḍa on it was erected by one Heliodoros, the son of Dion, an inhabitant of Takṣasilā, who came to the court of king Bhāgabhadra in the latter's fourteenth regnal year, as an ambassador of the Yavana king Antialkidas. The inscription is very interesting as it shows that Taxila region had now definitely passed under the house of Eucratides, that there was diplomatic relation between the Śuṅgas and the Yavanas; and, that even the foreigners had adopted the religion of Vāsudeva showing the proselytising character of the faith It also indirectly helps us in determining approximately the time when Antialkidas flourished. If Bhāgabhadra be the fifth king of the Śunga line, as we have suggested before, then according to the scheme of Purāṇic chronology, we have to place Antialkidas after 126 B.C., possibly about 112 B.C This also makes him a contemporary of Strato I. Dealing with the evidence of the Besnagar record, Marshall observes: "The purpose of the embassy is not stated, but it seems more than likely that Antialkidas was seeking to make common cause with the Śuṅga king against their mutual rival Strato I, whose dominions in the Eastern Punjab lay wedged in between their own. No doubt it was part of the political propaganda of Antialkidas for his ambassador to proclaim himself a follower of Viṣṇu (Bhāgavata) and set up a pillar in honour of that

36 *BMC*, under the various kings here mentioned, for Kharosthī on the coins, Whitehead, *NC*, 1923, p. 314f

deity; and indeed it is quite possible that in the Punjab itself Antialkidas was playing up to the Brāhmaṇical faction and making such use of it as he could to determine the power of the Euthydemids east of the Jhelum".[37] Thus pressed between the Śuṅgas and the descendants of Eucratides, Strato I had been maintaining a precarious existence which is reflected in the later issues of his coins.

Lysius

In this connection we should consider certain coins of Antialkidas issued conjointly with Lysius.[38] Of late there has been some controversy whether Lysius was the son or the father of Antialkidas. His coin-types, however, connects him with the house of Demetrius. What may then be the significance of these coins?

(a) Lysius must have been a contemporary of Antialkidas. Marshall places him about 125 B C,[39] but he might have ruled a little later.

(b) As Tarn thinks there was some approachment between the two houses during his time.[40]

(c) Rapson thinks that "it is perhaps equally probable that the types introduced into India by Demetrius had been a characteristic of a particular district, and therefore, continued to be used in that district after it had passed from the house of Euthydemus to the house of Eucratides.'[41] A similar view is also maintained by A. K. Narain.

Archebius

After Antialkidas the Taxila coins (types '*Pilei*') are continued by Archebius,[42] but after him it is no more used by

37 Marshall, *Taxila,* vol i. p. 37.
38 *BMC,* p 166.
39 Marshall, *l c.* p. 37
40 *GBI,* pp 314-15.
41 *CHI,* p. 559.
42 Whitehead, *NC* 1923, p 315

any Yavana ruler while it is again found on the coins of Liaka Kusulaka, the satrap of the Śaka king Maues, and hence it is believed that after Archebius the Śakas occupied Taxila. As we have already stated the Śakas occupied Taxila at the last quarter of the first century B.C. and hence there may have been some other causes for the state of affairs.

MENANDER

The type '*Pilei*' was the characteristic of the house of Eucratides, and it came to an end after Archebius evidently due to the rise of Menander who for the time being eclipsed the glory of the rival house, and who, as we have already stated, flourished in the first century B C. He was one of the greatest of the Indo-Bactrian monarchs, while his coins show that his authority extended over the Punjab, Gandhāra, Afghanistan and possibly also Sind. The '*Athene Alkes*' type shows his authority over the Eastern Punjab,[43] while the '*Bull and tripod* type over Gandhāra. Marshall thinks that his type "*Elephant and club* (*of Heracles*)" was possibly designed to commemorate his recovery of Eastern Arachosia and its re-union with Taxila.[44]

The Pali work *Milinda-pañha*[45] has immortalised his name.

43 Tarn observes "Menander's regular type on his coins was Athena striding and hurling the thunderbolt, a variant of the wide-spread Athena Alkis type of Macedonia, she had already been used by Demetrius II, but doubtless one reason for Menander's adoption of Athena was that she had been one of the three regular deities on the Alexander-coinage and that of the other two Zeus had become closely associated with Antiochus IV and Heracles with the Euthydemids, it may also be that in adopting the one Greek deity who had practically never been equated with anything Oriental but had remained Greek, he intended to emphasise the fact that, in spite of the predominantly Indian character of his empire, he was still a Greek king" (*GBI*, p 261)

44 Marshall, *l c*, vol i p. 32

45 *SBE*, vols. xxxv-xxxvi The work is divided into two parts and it is now generally believed that the second part of the work is later in date than the first one, and was evidently composed by a different author. For a critical discussion of the work, see Tarn. *GBI*, pp 414-436.

The work states that he was born at the village of Kalasi in the dvīpa of Alasanda which was 200 yojanas distant from Śākala. The measurement, evidently an approximate one, shows that this Alasanda should be identified with the Alexandria under the Caucasus. The account raises in itself two important issues : *first* at the time when Menander was born, Alexandria under the Caucasus, was a part of the dominion of the house of Eucratides, and so by his birth he was a natural subject of the house; *secondly*, as Tarn has pointed out, "whether the unknown name Kalasi be correct or not, we have the invaluable fact that Menander was born in a village. Hellenistic queens did not live in villages, neither was Hellenistic princes born in them; consequently—and this is the point which matters—Menander was born a commoner, and was not therefore a Euthydemid ".[46]

Thus the rise of Menander was a unique event in the annals of the Indo-Bactrians. The *Milinda-pañha* states that his capital was Śākala or Sialkot in the West Punjab Whitehead rejects the statement on the ground that it was not a mint city, and thinks that his capital was in the Kabul valley, in Afganistan, where according to him, most of the Bactrian kings lived for climatic reasons "since they were natives of a temperate climate and their comparatively small numbers would have been lost in the plains".[47] It is difficult to determine how far Whitehead's theory is correct, while Marshall thinks that his dominion comprised, besides the Trans-Indus regions in the west as far as Arachosia, "Kaccha and Surāṣtra and the sea-board beyond them as far as the port of Barygaza (Broach)'.[48] The *Periplus* informs us that in the second half of the first century A.D. the coins of Menander, along with those of Apollodotus, were in circulation in the port of Barygaza, but it appears to be somewhat risky to infer from it that Barygaza formed a part of the kingdom of Menander.

46 *GBI*, pp 420-1.
47 Whitehead, *NC*, 1940, pp. 3-4
48 Marshall, *l c*, p 32

The *Milinda-pañha* has preserved the story that Menander was converted to Buddhism by the Thera Nāgasena In the Buddhist lore, he occupies a position next to Aśoka and many of the legends connected with the name of the great Maurya emperor came also to be attributed to him. Thus like Aśoka, he is also described as renouncing the world and becoming an *arhat,* "and certain preliminaries to the meeting of Menander and Nāgasena in the *Milinda-pañha* are supposed to be taken from the story of the meeting of Aśoka with Tissa Mogaliputta"[49] Some of Menander's legends have again been traced to the story of the Buddha. Plutarch says that he was noted for his justice, and when he died his ashes were divided among the cities of his kingdom, and each city raised a stūpa over its portion. Here we are reminded how when Lord Buddha died stūpas were erected over his relics The statement that Menander's Council consisted of 500 men (*Yoṇakas*) may be compared with the fact that in the Buddhist lore the Lord is always accompanied by 500 *arhats,* when he moves from one place to another.

There have been different theories regarding Menander's exact relationship with Buddhism. Tarn observes : "The idea that Menander ever became a Buddhist in the sense of entering the Order may be dismissed at once; it depends on the story in the second part of the *Milinda,* which is not history, for the historical Menander did not retire from the world and hand over his throne to his son, but died leaving a son who was a minor and for whom his widow at first ruled as regent. He had an enormous number of Buddhist subjects and he probably could not have maintained his power without their support; politically, therefore, he must have done whatever seemed advisable to ensure that support, for no other cause was open to him .. No one can prove that Menander was not a Buddhist; but his adoption as his coin-type of the one Greek deity who was practically never equated with anything Oriental, Athena, is against it, and on what is known

49 Tarn, *l c*, p. 267.

it seems to be quite unsafe to call him a Buddhist even in the limited sense. . . ".[50]

We fully agree with Tarn that the second part of the *Milinda-pañha* contains many unhistorical statements, and where it is in opposition to the first part the latter is to be preferred The second part makes Milinda born as a prince in a royal dynasty, and this has been rightly rejected by Tarn and others. We, however, cannot at once reject the statement that he was succeeded by his son, though we may reject the story of his arhatship. Tarn comes to the conclusion that he was succeeded by a minor son, Strato I, with his queen, Agathoclea, as the regent, as he had been working on the theory of Rapson that Demetrius and Menander were contemporaries. *Secondly*, the figure of Athena on his coins hardly goes against his being a Buddhist, for on the coins of Kaniṣka also we find the figures of many non-Buddhist gods and goddesses. The type had been in use since the time of Agathoclea and Strato I and Menander had simply been copying their coins Menander would not have been extolled so much by the Buddhists, it is quite clear, had he not embraced their faith and championed their cause. The case appears to be more so when we find that even in Indo-China his name is connected with the origin of the most famous statue of the Buddha. Such strong traditions cannot be set aside lightly. Milinda was looked upon with honour even in the eleventh century, when Kṣemendra states "the Buddha prophesying to Indra that a king Milinda would erect a stūpa at Pāṭaligrāma". This shows how the legends about the king went on multiplying even in the mediaeval age.

The history of the Indo-Greek kings after Menander is obscure. We have no means to ascertain whether the houses

50 *ib*, pp 268-9. Marshall also maintains a similar view, and thinks that if Menander espoused the cause of Buddhism, it was entirely with a political purpose. (*l c.*, p. 33) We must consider very critically in this connection the presence of eight-spoked wheel on one of his bronze issues, *BMC*, p 50, no. 73, pl. xii 7 ; cf. *ASIR*, 1929-30, p. 65, no. 4.

of Eucratides and Euthydemus were revived, or whether the descendants of Menander who belonged to neither of the houses continued to rule in the valley of the Indus, till they were supplanted by the Śakas at the close of the first century B C. It has already been stated that Rapson and others relying on the evidence of the coins hold that the following kings ruled in the Puṣkalāvatī region, in the later period of the Greek rule—Diomedes, Epander, Philoxenus, Artemidorus and Peucolaus: while in the Eastern Punjab region, it is supposed, ruled the following kings—Dionysius, Apollodotus II, Zoilus, Hippostratus, Apollophanes, Nicias and others. A branch of the house of Eucratides further continued to rule in the Kabul valley.

We want to make the following observations in this connection:

(a) It is generally believed that the Puskalāvatī group of kings belonged to the house of Eucratides, while the kings of the Eastern Punjab to the house of Euthydemus. But since Menander ruled over both the regions and did not belong to either of the houses, and further since it is not unlikely that he may have left his successor (cf. *Milinda-pañha* account), we have to think whether some of these kings did not really belong to his house. The coin-types are not very sure guide since they were associated with particular regions, and may have been copied—in fact the Śaka kings copied them[51]—by the later kings. Whitehead again thinks that Hippostratus and Nicias ruled in Gandhāra.

(b) Some of the kings of the above two groups may have been sub-kings Tarn thinks that Hippostratus and Nicias flourished after Maues,[52] the Śaka king who ruled at the end of the first century B C. and the beginning of the first century A D.; but the theory rests on a very slender basis, for as we shall see later on, the stratification at Taxila clearly shows that Maues was succeeded by Azes I (*infra*).

51 *infra*, Ch iii.
52 *GBI*, p 326ff.

APPENDIX I

On the Tribal States

It has already been stated that after the death of Puṣyamitra, the Śuṅgas became a petty local power at Vidiśā, while the rest of the Ganges-Jumna valley, Rajasthan and the Eastern Punjab became divided into a number of petty states, some monarchical and others republican. This state of affairs continued up to the last quarter of the first century A.D. when North India up to Benares in the east again became united under the Imperial banner of the Kuṣāṇas. Coins are our chief source for studying the history of these petty principalities. On the basis of the palaeography of the coins these states may be arranged chronologically as follows:

2ND CENTURY B C :	Āgreya, Ārjunāyana, Kauśāmbī, Mālava, Mathurā, Pañcāla, Rājanya, Śivi, Trigarta, Udehika, Vaṭāśvaka and Yaudheya.
1ST CENTURY B. C. :	Almora, Audumbara, Ayodhyā, Kuninda, Mathurā, Vemaka, Vṛṣṇi-Rājanya, and Kauśāmbī.

From the above lists it is clear that some of these states of the second century B.C. were evidently merged in other principalities in the following century so that their number became reduced from twelve to eight. In order to have a clear conception about the history of the age under discussion, we must first of all deal briefly with the geographical location of these states.

(1) On the coins of the Āgreya janapada we find the legends *Agodaka Agāca janapada* and *Agācamitrapadabhiṣyāyināḥ*. It is thus apparent that the Āgreyas were the inhabitants of Agrodaka which may be identified with the modern Agroha in Hissar district, where these coins have been found.[1] It is diffi-

1 Dr. P. L. Gupta has made a critical study of these states, but he thinks that they came into existence after the fall of the Mauryas.

cult to agree with Allan that Agodaka or Angodraka may be identified with the Oxydrakai of the Greeks.[2]

(2) The coins of the Ārjunāyanas bear the legend Ārjunāyanānām jaya (—). "The epigraphy of the coins suggests a date about 100 B.C. and the lands of the Ārjunāyanas probably lay within the triangle Delhi-Jaipur-Agra".[3]

(3) We have already discussed the history of the Kauśāmbī janapada and have tried to show that it was never under the successors of Puṣyamitra. Kauśāmbī, identical with the modern Kosam, thirty miles south-west of Allahabad, has yielded a large number of coins showing that it was a monarchical state. In the second century B.C. the following kings possibly ruled over the kingdom—Sudeva, Bṛhaspatimitra, Parvata and Aśvaghoṣa.[4]

(4) During the time of Alexander's invasion, the Mālavas or the Malloi lived in the Upper Punjab in the valley of the Ravi. At a later period they evidently migrated to Eastern Rajputana and a large number of their coins have been found at Karkotanagar in the Jaipur district. Allan seems to be right when he holds that these are not earlier than the second century A D[5] That the Mālavas were in the same region in the second century B C. is proved by a seal found at Rairh.[6] They had a republican constitution, but the absence of their coins in the centuries immediately before the Christian era cannot be satisfactorily explained. It is not unlikely that they were at that time subordinate under the dynasty of Sarvatāta mentioned in the Ghosundi record.[7]

(5) The location of Mathurā is well-known and in the *Geographike* of Ptolemy it is described as 'the city of gods'. The coins of Mathurā "cover the period from the end of the

2 Allan, *Catalogue*, p. clviii.
3 *ib.*, p. lxxxiii.
4 *ib.*. pp 150-2
5 *ib.*, p cvi.
6 Excavations at Rairh, p. 71
7 Sircar, *Select Ins* p. 91.

third to the middle of the first century B.C. when we find these Hindu rulers succeeded by a dynasty of Śakas who bear the title Kṣatrapa, or Mahākṣatrapa". (*Allan*). As we shall see later on, however, the Śaka kṣatrapas occupied Mathurā not in the middle of the first century B.C. but in the early years of the first century A.D.

(6) Pañcāla corresponds to the present Rohilkhand region. Allan makes the following interesting observations regarding the Pañcāla coins: "The evidence of the uniformity of the coins and of their find-spots show that this 'Mitra' dynasty ruled in Northern Pañcāla, and perhaps also in part of Southern Pañcāla. The capital was Ahichhatra. They cannot be identified with the Śuṅgas. The dynasty was in existence before the Śuṅgas, if we date the accession of Puṣyamitra about 184 B C., and survived not only the Śuṅgas but also the Kāṇvas, probably disappearing with the latter before the Śakas".[8] It is, however, doubtful whether Pañcāla existed as an independent state in the pre-Puṣyamitra age. It possibly became independent after the death of the Senāpati and hence the Pañcāla series of coins may be supposed to have started about c.150 B.C.

(7) The Rājanya coins bear the legend *Rajaña-janapadasa* and they come mainly from the Hoshiarpur district of the Punjab, where accordingly the jānapada can be located. It was evidently a republican state.[9]

(8) The Śibis are identical with the Siboi of the Greek writers who locate the country between the Indus and the Chenub. Their coins belonging to the second century B. C. bear the legend *Majhamikāya-Śibi-janapadasa* showing that they occupied Madhyamikā near Chitor, where they had migrated sometime after the invasion of Alexander. There are other coins of the tribe bearing the simpler legend *Śibi-janapadasa*. They had a republican constitution[10]

8 Allan, *Catalogue*, cxx-cxxi *vide* f n 1. Ch. ii. *supra*, pp 19ff.
9 *ib*, cxxii-cxxiii, Jayaswal, *Hindu Polity*, i. pp. 158-9.
10 Allan *Catalogue*, cxxiii f "Statements in some modern writers

(9) The Trigarta country corresponds to the modern Jullundur, the land between the Ravi and the Sutlej. The Trigarta coins bear the legend *Trakatajanapadasa* in Brāhmī characters of the second century B.C. It was a republican state.[11]

(10) There are several coins bearing the inscription *Udehaki* in Brāhmī characters of the second century B C. As the provenance of the coins is not exactly known, it is difficult to determine the location of the janapada. Al-biruni states that Uddehika was near 'Bazana', 112 miles south-west of Kanauj.[12].

(11) Coins bearing the legend *Vatāśvaka* in characters of the early second century B.C. have been found in Taxila. Nothing is known about the state though we can possibly infer that "if not in the territory of Taxila, it was near enough to be in close commercial relations with it" [13]

(12) At a place in the neighbourhood of the town of Rohtak large number of coin moulds bearing the legend *Yaudheyānām Bahudhānyaka* have been found. In the Mahābhārata the Yaudheyas are described as *Rohitakas* showing that Rohitaka or Rohtak was their home.[14] It has been assumed that *Bahudhānyaka* is identical with the Hariana tract of the Punjab which includes Rohtak. Allan says that "the coins of the Yaudheyas fall into three periods, Classes 1, 2, and 5 of the late second and the first centuries B C. indicating a period of independence, from the fall of the Mauryas (Puṣyamitra ?) to the coming of the Kuṣāṇas. Classes 3-4 belong to the later

that the Sibi was a very primitive race are merely reproductions of a mistake in, or rather perhaps of a false impression given by the Alexander-historians ; they were at least as civilised as their neighbours as is, shown by the Greek praise of their capital, by their coinage at Madhyamikā, and by the story in the Śibi-Jātaka of the charitable Sibi king who was the hero of the Flesh-gift and was reincarnated as Buddha". (*GBI*, p. 170).

11 Allan, *Catalogue*, cxl. "*Jālandharāstrigartāh syuh*" (*Abhidhānacintāmani*).

12 Allan, *Catalogue*, cxli.

13 *ib.*, cxlvii Rapson thinks that it is not a place name but a division of the Aśvaka, *Indian Coins*, p. 14.

14 Mbh. II. 32. 4-5

second cntury A.D., and the poor state of the currency probably reflects the disastrous effects of Rudradāman's victory and the war with the Śakas. The fine coins of Class 6, which like the seals ... reveal strong Kushān influence, show the tribe well-established again in the third and fourth centuries A D. Their currency came to an end with the Gupta conquest"[15] The Yaudheya coins belonging to the pre-Christian age have on them the legend *Mahārajasa* while others have *Yaudheyānām*. The second legend clearly shows that Yaudheya was a republican state. What may be the significance of the first legend ? Either *Mahāraja* may be the personal name of the leader of the Yaudheya republic or, in the alternative, we have to assume that for some time the Yaudheya state passed under monarchical form of government.

From the above discussions, it will be seen that while the republican states mainly lay in the Eastern Punjab and the province of Rājasthan, the monarchical states studded the Ganges-Jumna valley. In the next century, most of these republics lost their independent status and their independent coinage evidently ceased to exist. Though it is difficult to determine the exact cause of this state of affairs, we may venture to suggest that the rise of Menander may have been one of the contributory causes for the disappearance of the republican states, specially in the Punjab region. In Rajputana the rise of king Gājāyana Sarvatāta may have been another such factor. This also supports our contention that Menander flourished in the first century B. C. and not in the first half of the second century as proposed by Rapson and other scholars. Tarn also thinks that "these peoples probably covered the whole of Menander's domain between the Madras and the frontier south of Mathurā".[16] As we have already seen, following Rapson, Tarn also places Menander in the first half of the second century B C, but in that case, we fail to understand how can he come to the above conclusion regarding

15 Allan, *Catalogue*, clii-cliii, see also Ch vi. *infra*
16 *GBI*, p 240

the extent of the empire of the Yavana monarch. In fact, all the sources when combined together clearly show that Menander flourished in the first part of the first century B.C., and his rise was responsible for the disappearance of the republican states in the Punjab.

After the death of Menander several new states again rose up in the Punjab, most of them having republican constitution. They were as follows:

(a) Audumbara: The coins attributed to the Audumbaras have been mostly found in the Pathankot and the Jwalamukhi regions Some coins have also been collected in the Hoshiarpur district This shows that "the Audumbaras should be located in the area formed by the eastern part of the modern Kangra district, the Gurdaspur district and the Hoshiarpur district, that is to say, the valley of the Beas, or perhaps the wider region between the Upper Sutlej and the Ravi".[17] In the first century B.C. it had a monarchical form of government, and the coins supply us with the following four names of their kings: Śivadāsa, Rudradāsa, Mahādeva and Dharaghosa.[18] Allan thinks that at the end of the first century B.C. and the beginning of the first century A.D. a new dynasty came to the throne and to this new dynasty belonged kings like Rudravarman, Āryamitra, Mahīmitra and Bhānumitra.[19] On the coins of Rudravarman, there is the legend *Vijayaka-rajñ(o)* (*var. Vijayaya-raña*) *Vemakisa Rudravarmasa*". According to Allan the legend means 'of the victorious king Rudravarman, the Vimaki'. The Vimaki is evidently the name of the dynasty to which Rudravarman belonged.

(b) Kuninda: We have already stated that the Kunindas occupied a narrow strip of land at the foot of the Siwalik hills between the Jumna and the Sutlej and the territory between the upper courses of the Beas and the Sutlej. Coins disclose the name of Amoghabhūti a king of the country.[20]

17 Allan, *Catalogue*, lxxxvii; vide, *supra*, Ch. ii & f.n. (8).
18 *ib*., p. 122f.
19 *ib*., p. 125f.
20 ib, p. 159f, *vide*, *supra*, Ch ii & f n (10).

(c) Rājanya: This republican state, as already stated, existed in the preceding century, and in the first century B.C. we find that they used Brāhmī characters in their coins in the legend *Rājaña janapadasa.*[21]

The monarchical states of the Ganges-Jumna valley like Mathurā, Pañcāla, Ayodhyā, Kauśāmbī, etc., continued their existence as before till they were conquered by the Kuṣāṇas in the second half of the first century A.D. (*infra*).

21 *ib.*, p 210f.

APPENDIX II

ON THE DATE OF KHĀRAVELA

Some scholars are inclined to think that Khāravela flourished in the first quarter of the second century B C., on the following grounds:—

(a) that the Hathigumpha inscription is dated in the 165th year of the Maurya era corresponding to the thirteenth year of Khāravela (*l.* 16) (*Dubreuil*);

(b) that Bahasatimita who was compelled to adore the feet of the Kaliṅga king (*l* 12) is no other than Puṣyamitra (*Jayaswal*);

(c) that in *l* 6 of the Hathigumpha record, Khāravela claims that he caused a canal to be dug out again that was originally constructed by king Nanda who must be identified with Nandivardhana (*Jayaswal*):

(d) that in *l.* 8 of the record, we have a reference to the Yavana rāja Dimita who fled away to Mathurā on the approach of Khāravela, and this Dimita can only be identified with Demetrius I who was the contemporary of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga (*Sten Konow*).

None of the above arguments appear to be valid: (a) what has been read in the *l.* 16 of the Hathigumpha record as *Muriya-kāla* is really *mukhiya-kalā* or *mukhya-kalā*, and further there is no evidence of any Maurya era starting from the accession of Chandra Gupta Maurya in c. 324 B C Had such been the case, Aśoka would have dated his records in that era instead of in his regnal years; (b) the identification of Bahasatimita with Puṣyamitra is far from certain. Jayaswal's argument that as Bṛhaspati is the lord, *nakṣatrādhīpa*, of the nakṣatra Pusyā or Tissa in the house of Cancer in which the planet becomes ascendant (*tuṅga*), Bahasatimita should be identified with Puṣyamitra who occupied the ascendant position in North India, has got no historical basis. As H. C.

Raychaudhuri points out, the *Divyāvadāna* makes a distinction between a king named Bṛhaspati and Puṣyamitra.[1] R. P. Chanda aptly remarks: "Even if we admit that Bṛhaspati was also identified by the ancient Hindus with Puṣyā, that does not justify the identification of Bṛhaspatimitra with Puṣyamitra any more than the denotation of the same god by the terms Skanda and Kumāra justifies the identification of Skanda Gupta with Kumāra Gupta".[2] It has already been shown that Bahasatimita had been possibly a king of the Kauśāmbī region, and his jurisdiction might have extended over Magadha as well;[3] (c) similarly, there is some difficulty in accepting the identification of Nandarāja mentioned in the Hathigumpha record with Nandavardhana or Nandivardhana. Nandivardhana was a king of the dynasty of Śiśunāga, and there is no evidence that the Siśunāgas had to do anything with Kaliṅga. As H. C. Raychaudhuri points out: "It is not Nandivardhana but Mahāpadma Nanda who is said to have brought 'all under his sole sway' and 'uprooted all Kṣatriyas' or the old ruling families. So we should identify 'Naṁdarāja' of the Hathigumpha inscription, who held possession of Kaliṅga either with the all-conquering Mahāpadma Nanda or one of his sons".[4] Barnett thinks that Nandarāja may have been a local king of Kaliṅga; but the view goes against the internal evidence of the Hathigumpha inscription. As Nandarāja is said to have ruled some 300 years before Khāravela, the latter evidently flourished at the second half of the first century B.C., or somewhat later; (d) as regards the identification of the Yavana rāja Dimita with Demetrius I, it may be noted what R. P. Chanda has stated in *IHQ*, v. p. 598: "The chronological impossibilities in these identifications become still more apparent when attempt is made to reconstruct the history of Magadha from 175 to 170 B.C on their basis. If Demetrius, son of Euthydemus, retired from India to face Eucratides when Khā-

1 *PHAI*, p. 374
2 *IHQ*, v. p 597
3 *Supra*, p 19
4 *PHAI*, p 377.

ravela laid siege to Rājagṛha, the latter event must have happened in the year 175(*Jayaswal*) or 174 (*Sten Konow*) B.C. As this year corresponds to the eighth year of Khāravela's reign, he must have ascended the throne of Kalinga in 183 or 182 B.C. With Khāravela's siege of Rājagṛha, the revolt of Eucratides in Bactria and the retreat of Demetrius, Messrs Sten Konow and Jayaswal link two other events, the siege of Sāketa and Madhyamikā by Demetrius and a hoise sacrifice (the first horse sacrifice according to Mr. Jayaswal) of Puṣyamitra. As we have already seen, Patañjali's statements in the *Mahābhāṣya* clearly indicate that the siege of Sāketa and Madhyamikā by the Yavana (*i.e.*, the Yavana king) and the horse sacrifice of Puṣyamitra were not, strictly speaking, contemporaneous events". In Ch. I, it has already been shown that the siege of Demetrius took place before Puṣyamitra ascended the throne of Magadha after murdering Bṛhadratha, and this goes strongly against the proposed identification

Thus it appears that in determining the date of Khāravela we have to depend on the palæographical evidence of the Hathigumpha record, which as already stated,[5] points to a date in the second half of the first century B.C., and the meaning of the expression "*Pañcame ca dāni vase Namda—rāja-ti-vasa-sata-o(gh)ātitam Tanasuliya-vāta panādim nagaram pavesayati*", showing that Khāravela flourished some *ti-vasa-sata* years after Naṃda-rāja. Now, the expression *ti-vasa-sata* may either mean 103 or 300. As it is stated that in the fifth year of his reign Khāravela caused the canal opened out by king Nanda *ti-vasa-sata* years back to be brought into the capital, we have to place the accession of Khāravela either 98 or 295 years after the time of the Nanda-rāja. If taken in the former sense, Khāravela becomes king in 324-98=226 B.C. This date can in no case be later, though there is every possibility that it may be somewhat earlier. The Hathigumpha record further states that he was elevated to the position of Yuvarāja nine

5 Sircar, *Select Ins*, p. 206, fn. 1

years before his accession, *i.e.*, in c. 235 B C. It appears also from the above discussion that in c. 235 B C. Khāravela's father was on the throne of Kaliṅga and he also had his predecessor or predecessors who thus becomes a contemporary of Aśoka along with Khāravela's father as well But from the inscriptions of Aśoka we learn that in his time Kaliṅga was governed by a Maurya Kumāra under the suzerainty of Aśoka. This shows that the expression *ti-vasa-sata* cannot be taken in the sense of 103.

The above discussions clearly show that we can take the expression only in the sense of 300, which would place Khāravela in the second half of the first century B. C. This interpretation, as we have already seen, is supported by the literary and the archæological data at our disposal.

CHAPTER III

THE ŚAKAS AND THE PARTHIANS

I

THE TRIBAL MOVEMENTS IN CENTRAL ASIA

SOURCES

We have already stated that the Greek rule in Bactria came to an end about 145 B C. under the pressure of the nomads of Central Asia, who again at the end of the first century B.C. caused the downfall of the Greeks in India. The story of the tribal movements is unfolded to us chiefly by the Chinese authors. The tribes inhabiting Central Asia were first known to the Chinese through the *Report* of Chang-kien which is incorporated in Ch. 123 of Tsi-ma-tsien's *Shi-ki*. Chang-kien's *Report* is based on the affairs of Central Asia prevailing in the second century B.C.. Chavannes thinks that in all probability the *Shi-ki* was completed about 99 B.C. Chapter 123 of the work contains the famous *Report* and it has been translated into English by Dr. Fr. Hirth in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. xxxvii, 1917, pp. 89ff, to the excellence of which many have testified.

For the period after 100 B C., two Chinese works are useful: the *Tsien-Han-shu* or the *Annals of the First Han* Dynasty and the *Hou-Han-shu* or the *Annals of the Later Han Dynasty*. The *Tsien-Han-shu* comes down to 24 A.D. It was compiled by Pan-ku and after his death was finished by his sister Pan-tcha. It records the story of the First Han Dynasty, which was founded by Liu-Pang, a soldier of fortune from Central China, in year 202 B.C. It is thus evident that for the period 202-100 B C, the *Tsien-Han-shu* overlaps the *Shi-ki*. Important portions of the *Tsien-Han-shu*, specially *94a-b*, have been translated by Parker in the *China Review*, xx, pp 1 ff and 109ff, xxi, 100ff and 129ff, while *96a-b* has been translated by Wylie in the

Journal of the Anthropological Institute, 1881, pp. 20ff and 83ff, and also by de Groot in *Die Westlande Chinas in der Vorchristlichen Zeit*

Chapter 118 of the *Hou-Han-shu* gives us some glimpses of the Yueh-chi. The work was composed by Fan-ye who based his account on the reports of Pan-young (c. 125 A.D.) and others The *Hon-Han-shu* covers the period between A D. 25 and A D. 220 for the history of China. But for the Yueh-chi it gives the picture of the period A.D. 25 to A D. 125. This chapter has been translated with valuable notes by E. Chavannes in *Toung Pao*, viii, 1907, pp. 149-234.

Tribal movement

We learn from the *Shi-ki* and the *Tsien-Han-shu* that the Hunnish king Chi-yu inflicted a crushing defeat on the Yueh-chi, a people of the Indo-Iranian stock[1] who were at that time occupying the extreme eastern and north-eastern parts of Kashgaria, or, in other words, the region adjoining the Hunnish dominions in Mongolia. The Yueh-chi king was killed and in the terrible panic that followed, the tribe became scattered. One started towards the west and came to be known as the Ta-Yueh-chi and the other moved directly to the south settled among the Tibetans or the Kiang and came to be known as the Hsiao or the Little Yueh-chi. The Ta or the Great Yueh-chi defeated the Wu-sun in course of their westward march, in the neighbourhood of the original Yueh-chi territory, and not in the country of the Ili river (now called Kulja) as Rapson thinks,[2] and the Wu-sun king was killed while the crown prince fled to the Hunnish court where he grew up as a page-boy. When the crown prince grew up to manhood, he defeated the Yue-chi and recovered his homeland. The Yueh-chi were forced to move again towards the west and we learn from the Chinese sources that they fell upon the Sai or the Śakas.

1 For a discussion about the nationality of the Yueh-chi, de la Vallee-Poussin, *L'Inde Aux Temps des Mauryas etc*, pp 303ff

2 *CHI*, p. 565

As a result of this attack—(i) the Sai-wang moved south and ruled over Ki-pin; (ii) the Sai were scattered and at times formed several kingdoms.[3]

(i) Konow interprets the word Sai-wang as equivalent to the Śaka-Muruṇḍa, a branch of the vast Śaka horde,[4] while as pointed out by Chavannes, Levi and others the term Ki-pin denoted Kashmir with a portion of the Punjab plain. Its identification with the Kāpiśa country as proposed by some scholars[5] is certainly wrong.

(ii) The Śakas who were thus attacked by the Yueh-chi, possibly occupied Bactria, as pointed out by McGovern and others,[6] and thus the Greek rule there came to an end. Evidently this event forced Heliocles to move to the south of the Hindukush.[7] The Yueh-chi, however, had been following them and the Śakas were forced to leave Bactria also. This fresh exodus of the Śakas followed the two main branches of the great road from Bactria, one leading to Mesopotamia through Merv, Hecatompylos and Ecbatana, and the other through Merv, Herat and Seistan to India.[8]

The strong Parthian empire in the west naturally acted as a great barrier against the further movement of the Śakas, and sooner or later, a conflict was inevitable. We learn from Justin that the Parthian monarch Phraates II (138-128 B.C.) was killed in battle against them. Artabanus II (128-123 B.C.),

3 Remusat, *Nouveaux Melanges Asiatiques*, i. p. 205; Wylie, p. 34ff The *T'sien Han Shu* seems to show further that some of the Śakas who could not move were ultimately absorbed in the Yueh-chi horde, Wylie, ii p. 84, *SPIH*, p 30.

4 *CII*, II. i xx. f.

5 Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, p. 336 Konow thinks that it is Kāpiśa, *Ep. Ind.* xiv. p. 291f; see also Tarn, *GBI*. p. 473, f.n. 1 for its identification with Kabul, which seems to be a hardly satisfactory one; Chattopadyaya, *SI*. p 3f. for further discussions

6 Cal. Rev. 1949, pp. 192f

7 *supra*, p. 19ff

8 Tarn, "*Seleucid Parthian Studies*", Proceedings of the British Academy, 1930 p 117f; for the Śaka conquest of Bactria, Strabo, xi. 5, 11; Trogus, 41-2.

the successor of Phraates, inherited the great Śaka problem and bought temporary peace by paying them tribute. But ultimately his patience was exhausted and he was constrained to take up arms and lost life in the battle-field.[9] When Mathridates II, the Great (123-88 B.C.), came to the throne, Parthia entered into a new chapter of her history. He put great pressure on the scythians and it is generally believed that they migrated to India either during his reign[10] or just after it,[11] by way of Ariana taking the usual route, which Craterus had once followed by Kandahar and the Bolan or the Mulla pass over the Brahui mountains leading to the country of the Lower-Indus or Sind, which thus came to be known as Indo-Scythia. The date of the migration, however, is intimately connected with the period of the Śaka king Maues, the first Iranian Śaka to rule in India. We shall discuss later on the reign of this king and shall see that this migration took place at the close of the first century B. C.

In India, we have thus two distinct bands of Śakas, the Sai-wang or the Muruṇḍas, as Konow calls them, and the Śakas of the Eastern Iran who had imbibed a strong Parthian element in their culture before their advent to India. The historical section of the *Purāṇas* also mention the Śakas and the Muruṇḍas separately; "When the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end, there will be kings belonging to the lineage of their servants: 7 Andhras and 10 Ābhīra kings, also 7 Gardabhins, 18 Śakas. There will be 8 Yavanas, 14 Tusāras, 13 Muruṇḍas and 11 Hūnas"[12]

9 Devevoise, *A Political History of Parthia*, pp. 31, 35-39, 58.
10 *SPIH*, p. 325.
11 *CII*. II. i. xxxvi; *CHI*, pp. 567-8.

II

THE SAKAS IN INDIA

(a) The Muruṇḍas

Very little is known regarding the history of the Sai-wang or the Muruṇḍas of Ki-pin. The *Han-shu* states that attacked by the Yueh-chi "the Sai-wang went southwards and traversed Hien-tu", or the Hanging Gorge which is located 'on the Indus in a ssw. direction from Kashgar, a little to the west of Skardo, and near the boundary of the modern Dardistan'. The mention of the Hanging Gorge seems to indicate that the Sai-wang took the Kashmir route.[13] Some scholars think that no tribal migration is possible through such difficult tracts of no man's land, but the discoveries of Stein make it highly probable that the region was inhabited from a very early period, to at least upto the sixth century A.D., and thus the route also may have been used.[14]

The *T'sien-Han-shu,* 96a, 10-12, gives the following brief history of Ki-pin·

> The relations of China with Ki-pin began at the period of Wu-ti (140-85 B.C.). Inasmuch as it was remote and far distant, the Chinese troops could not reach the country. The prince of the land, Wu-tou-lao, had several times killed Chinese envoys. When Wu-tou-lao died, his son succeeded to the throne. He sent envoys to bring tribute. The official in the frontier district, Wen-chung, accompanied these envoys The prince, however, proposed once more to do violence to Wen-chung. Wen-chung became aware of it, and opened negotiations with the son of the prince of Jung-ku by

12 Pargiter, *DKA*, p 72.

13 *SI*, p. 4.

14 *ib.* For the view that no tribal migration is possible through the route, see *JRAS*, 1913, p. 635, f n. 1 & 2 ; *CHI*, pp. 563-4 ; *GBI*. pp. 277-8 ; for Stein's discoveries, *JRAS*, 1944

name Yin-mo-fu. Both attacked Ki-pin on a concerted plan and killed its princes, whereupon Yin-mo-fu was appointed prince of Ki-pin. The incident occured during the reign of the emperor Hsüan-ti, which lasted from 73 to 48 B.C. In the reign of Yüan-ti (48-33 B.C.), Yin-mo-fu killed the escort of a Chinese envoy and later on sent an envoy to apologise for the act In the reign of Cheng-ti (32-7 B.C) other envoys were sent to China from Ki-pin, possibly by Yin-mo-fu.[15]

A few scholars think that Yin-mo-fu was the Sai-wang (Śaka king), who being pressed by the Yueh-chi, entered Ki-pin. Yin-mo-fu's occupation of Ki-pin cannot be in any case prior to 73 B C (during the reign of the Emperor Hsüan-ti), while the Sai-wang started on migration long before this date, earlier than the embassy of Chang Kien in c. 136 B C. Yin-mo-fu's achievement probably shows the overthrow of the rule of the Sai-wang in Ki-pin, and the establishment of a new dynasty—a revolution in which the Chinese also took part.[16]

(*b*) The Śakas of Taxila

Let us now turn to the history of the Iranian Śakas who first settled in Indo-Scythia,[17] (*supra* p. 63) and later on caused the downfall of the Greek rule in the Upper Indus valley. Sir John Marshall's excavation in Taxila shows that the earliest Śaka king to rule there was Maues who was succeeded by a king named Azes. Smith and other scholars think that there were, in fact, two kings of the name of Azes, and the theory appears to be supported by the following data: (a) the coins which are assigned to Azes II are found generally

15 Wylie, p. 36; *SI*, p. 8.

16 *EECA*, p. 208; for Tarn's interpretation of the account, *GBI*, p. 340f; for the criticism of the same, *SI*, p. 9.

17 The term Indo-Scythia is possibly used for the first time in the *Periplus* (c 60-80 A D) It is also mentioned in the *Georgraphike* of Ptolemy

nearer the surface than those of Azes I, (b) coins of Azes II (with Aspavarman) are found in company with the coins of Gondophaines, which shows that Gondopharnes ruled after Azes II, but the evidence of coins proves that Azes I was succeeded by one Azilises, (c) Aspavarman appears to have been strategos in the reign of Gondopharnes, as well as in that of Azes, and it is impossible that this Azes can be Azes I[18]

Between Azes I and Azes II, there appears to have been a king named Azilises. This is proved by the evidence of two series of coins. In the first, we have the name of Azes in Greek characters and that of Azilises in Kharoṣṭhī, while in the second the name of Azilises appears in Greek and that of Azes in Kharoṣṭhī This clearly indicates that Azes I was succeeded by Azilises who in his turn was succeeded by Azes II.

A gold coin reveals the existence of a king named Aṭhama. Whitehead thinks that Aṭhama was a member of the dynasty of Azes and Azilises. But it is difficult to place him in the genealogical table of the dynasty and his date is also uncertain. One peculiar feature of the names of the Śaka kings of Taxila is the final particle 'es' (Mau+es, Az+es, Azilis+es etc.) which, however, is not found in the name of this king.

Date of Maues

The date of Maues has been a subject of great controversy with the Indologists and has been determined by (i) *numismatic* evidences, and (ii) by referring the *Taxila Copper Plate of the year 78* mentioning the great king Moga=Maues to particular era[19]

It may be stated at the outset that the numismatic evidences lead us nowhere regarding the date of the king. He copies not only the coins of Demetrius but of Antialkidas as

18 *JRAS,* 1914, p. 979.

19 For the Taxila plate of the year 78, *CII.* II. i. p. 28; Sircar, *Select Ins.*, p. 120.

well.[20] From his imitation of certain Greek coin-types which seem to be connected with Puṣkalāvatī, it has been inferred that he ruled over that region,[21] while the similarity of the monogram on certain coins of Maues with that of Telephus led Tarn to conclude that Maues must have conquered Kāpiśa.[22] But as yet not a single coin of the king has been found either in the Puṣkalāvatī or the Kāpiśa regions,[23] a fact which shows that he did not rule in those places. This shows the weakness of the so-called "*mint-theory*", which is of value only when it is supported by the provenance of the coins.

Let us now, therefore, try to ascertain the era to which the Taxila Copper Plate of the year 78 may be referred, and this evidently depends on the fixation of an approximate time when Maues flourished The Taxila Plate speaks of a subordinate satrap Liaka Kusulaka who has been identified with Liaka mentioned in the Manshera inscription[24] of the year 68, a fact which shows that the empire of Maues comprised a good portion of Kashmir i.e., Ki-pin. From the Chinese sources, on the other hand, we learn that Ki-pin = Kashmir was under the rule of Yin-mo-fu even after 32 B.C.[25] This proves that Maues cannot be placed before that date and that the migration of the Iranian Śakas into India took place at the close of the first century B C. As the Vikrama era, which starts from 58 B C., had already been in vogue before the date of Maues, and as we have instances of its use in the Kharoṣṭhī records, it may be inferred that the Taxila Plate is also dated in that era. Ghirshman thinks that the Vikrama era has been used in practically all the older records, while, however, there was

20 See in this connection, Whitehead, *NC*. 1946. This shows that the theory that Maues ruled after Antialkidas cannot be accepted.

21 *CHI*, p 570

22 *GBI*, p 332

23 A single coin of Maues was discovered in the Kabul valley and evidently it proves nothing regarding the extent of the kingdom.

24 *Ep Ind*. xxi p 257 ; *PHAI*, p 444, f n 3

25 *supra*, pp 64-5.

a separate Maues era and to it should be assigned the Taxila Plate[26] Similary Rapson ascribes this single Kharoṣṭhī record to an era of 150 B.C. and Tarn to an era of 155 B C,[27] while both the scholars assign all other older Kharoṣṭhī records to the Vikrama era of 58 B.C. A solitary era for a single inscription appears to be highly improbable and unconvincing. In fact, these scholars had to think of a somewhat earlier date for Maues as they laid too much emphasis on the evidence of coins which, however, as we have already stated, leads us nowhere The theory that the Vikrama era was started by Azes,[28] or that it started from the year of his death,[29] can hardly be accepted for Azes I uses the square Greek omicron on some of his coins, side by side with the round form. The square "O" makes its appearance in Parthia during the reign of Orodes I (57-38 B C.). Azes evidently learnt it from the Parthians and thus he can hardly be the founder of the Vikrama era.

According to the Vikrama era of 58 B C., the date of the Taxila C P. of the year 78 would be 20 A D. That Maues was ruling at the first quarter of the Christian era can be corroborated from other sources as well. The Taxila Plate mentions the satrap Liaka Kusulaka and his son mahādānapati Patika, who

26 *Begram*, pp. 105-8 ; cf. Fleet, *JRAS*. 1907, pp 169-72 , an era of Maues was also advocated by R P Chanda, *JRAS*, 1920, p. 319, and formerly by Marshall (*ASIR*, 1912-3, p 7 ; *JRAS*, 1914, p. 896) but he now prefers the theory of Tarn primarily that the Taxila plate should be assigned to an era of c 155 B C., and of Rapson secondarily, c. 150 B C. (*Taxila*, I. 45). A solitary era for a single inscription appears to be highly improbable and unconvincing.

27 Rapson thinks that an era was started c 150 B.C. "to mark the establishment of the new kingdom in Seistan after its incorporation into the Parthian empire by Mithridates I" (*CHI*, p. 570) Tarn refers the record to the Śaka era of c 155 B C. (*GBI*, pp 494-502). Lohuizen de Leeuw refers all the earlier Kharoṣṭhī records to an era of 129 B C.., "when the Yueh-chi rule moved across the Oxus into Bactria dispossessing the Greeks" (*SPIH*, II. esp pp 28, 34, 48 etc); for other theories, *GBI*, App. 16.

28 Marshall, *JRAS*, 1914, p. 977 , Rapson, *CHI*, p 571

29 de la Vallee-Poussin, *l c.* p 267

must be identical with the mahākṣatrapa Patika of the Mathura Lion Capital inscription, which mentions the mahākṣatrapa Rājula and his son kṣatrapa Sodāsa as well.[30] This kṣatrapa Soḍāsa is again identical with the mahākṣatrapa Soḍāsa mentioned in the Āmohini Votive tablet,[31] which Sir John Marshall assigns to the beginning of the Christian era, on account of the style of its carving,[32] and which belongs to A.D. 14, if its date, in the year 72, is referred to the Vikrama era. Patika was a contemporary of Soḍāsa, and thus he can be assigned to the first quarter of the Christian era.

Some Objections

It can be said against this view that if both the inscriptions of sam. 72 and sam 78 be referred to the same era, then Patika first becomes a mahākṣatrapa, and then holds a subordinate rank under his father as mahādānapati But here we have to bear in mind the fact that all the sections of the Mathura Lion Capital inscription were not executed at the same time.[33] Hence it is quite likely that Section G of the record, which mentions mahākṣatrapa Patika was executed sometimes after 20 A D., after he had been elevated to the higher office, and thus he may be regarded as a younger contemporary of Soḍāsa.

From the above discussions, we can make the following inferences:

(a) that Maues came to the throne sometimes after 32 B C. and ruled upto c 20 A D.;

(b) that if the Taxila Plate of the year 78 may be ascribed to the Vikrama era, then there remains no difficulty in assigning all the older Kharoṣṭhī records to the same era.

Tarn has adduced two grounds against assigning the Taxila Plate of Maues to the Vikrama era; first, the Vikrama era was

30 For the Mathura Lion Capital inscription, Thomas, *Ep. Ind.* ix p. 141 f: CII II. i p. 48

31 *Ep Ind.* ii. p. 199, ix pp. 243-4; xxi p. 257n.

32 *CHI* p 633.

33 *SI.* p. 18

started after a Śaka defeat and it therefore appears to be impossible that the Śaka kings would use it in their records ; and secondly, it is a fixed point that Gondopharnes' reign began in Taxila in 19 A D. while the Taxila Plate if assigned to the Vikrama era would make Maues reign there in 20 A.D.[34]

The first of the above objections is evidently based on the account of the Jaina legend *Kālakācāryakathānaka,* a hopelessly late and corrupt account which can hardly be used for historical purposes The legend runs as follows :

> Gardhabhila, the king of Ujjayinī, abducted Sarasvatī, the sister of the Jaina monk Kālaka In order to punish the king, Kālaka went to the kula of the Śakas, on the other side of the Sindhu and sought their help. He induced some of the chiefs to accompany him. They embarked on a ship, crossed the Indus, proceeded to the Surāṣṭra viṣaya and divided that country among themselves. When the autumn came, one of them went to Ujjayinī, dethroned and imprisoned Gardhabhila and established one of the feudatories as the king of the land. The Śaka king who lived on the other side of the Indus used the title Ṣāhānuṣāhi, while his feudatories were simply styled Ṣāhis. The rule of the Śaka feudatory in Ujjayinī, the story runs, lasted only for four years, when the Vikramāditya drove out the foreigners and established an era of his own, which has been identified with the historic Vikrama era, commencing from 58 B C.[35]

The unhistorical character of the above account is quite apparent. The Śakas never used the title of Ṣāhānuṣāhi which was mainly a Kuṣāṇa title Further, from the epigraphic records it appears that even in the ninth century A.D. the name of Vikrama was not universally connected with the era In-

34 *GBI,* p. 494.

35 *The Story of Kālaka, Texts, history, legend* etc. by W. N. Brown, 1933 , also *Vikrama Volume.*

deed, there has been much dispute regarding the origin of the reckoning. Dr. D C. Sircar thinks that "the Vikrama era is identical with the Drangian reckoning that may have been started to indicate the independent status of East Iran and to oust the Arsacid era starting from 248 B.C, when Parthia itself threw off both the Seleucid yoke and the Seleucid era of 312 B C."[36] If this be the case there is no valid ground for Tarn's objection. As we have already stated Azes I cannot be the founder of the era but, as Sir John Marshall thinks, the Vikrama era somehow came to be associated with the name of Azes.[37] This is of course not unlikely for we find that an era often becomes associated with the name of its user. Thus the name of the Śakas became associated with the era that was originally started by Kaniṣka I, the Kuṣāna king, just as the Gupta era became associated with the name of the Valabhi family

As regards the second objection of Tarn it may be pointed out that the Takht-i-Bāhī inscription[38] of Gondopharnes of the year 45 A D is dated in his 26th regnal year showing that really he became king in 19 A.D. But there is no proof that in that year his charge included Taxila As we shall see later on he came to power in Eastern Iran, evidently in 19 A D, and occupied Taxila at a later date.

Thus we find that there is no valid objection against assigning the Taxila Plate of Maues to the so-called Vikrama era of 58 B C. Dr. D C. Sircar also assigns all the earlier Kharoṣṭhī records to this era and gives the following dates for Maues and his successors[39]:

1. Maues (Moa, Moga), c. 20 B C-A D 22.
2. Azes (Aya) I, c 5 B C.—A.D. 30; son (?) of Spalirises of east Iran and son-in-law (?) of No. 1.
3. Azilises (Ayilisha), c. A D. 28-40; son (?) of No 2.
4. Azes (Aya, Aja) II, c. A.D. 35-79; son (?) of No. 3.

36 *AIU*, p 127

37 *Taxila*, i

38 *Ep Ind* xviii. p 282, *CII* II. i p 62, *Select Ins* pp 121-2.

39 *Select Ins* pp. 109-32; *AIU*, p. 127

Nothing definitely is known about the achievements of Maues. It has been asserted by some numismatists that as the figure of Poseidon appears on some of his coins he may have achieved some naval victory.[40] Cunningham has read the name Moa in the Maira inscription of the year 58. This shows that Maues ruled for at least 20 years, if not more, from 1 B.C to 20 A.D.

FAMILY OF VONONES

It is generally believed that Azes I who succeeded Maues at Taxila came from Eastern Iran and belonged to an entirely different family[41] Thus for sometimes Maues and Azes I had been ruling contemporaneously in two different kingdoms. A series of coins discloses the existence of the family of Azes in Eastern Iran beginning with king Vonones. On the coins the name and title of Vonones are given in Greek language and script according to the regular Parthian formula while those of his relatives, associated with him in administration, are given in Indian Prākrt and the Kharoṣṭhī script. There can be no doubt that Vonones was the suzerain and that his relatives were his subordinate colleagues, who were obliged to use an Indian language and script in order to make their coin legends intelligible to their subjects on the Indian borderland, "while Vonones continued the old Bactrian and Parthian practice of using the Greek language and script as being one of the successors of Alexander". Vonones evidently administered some part of his possessions through the agency of his near relatives probably armed with viceregal power. Numismatic evidence gives names of three such relatives, (i) Spalahora, (ii) Spalagadama, and (iii) Spalirises. On the available coins found Vonones is associated with—(a) Spalahora, described as *mahārajabhrata,* and (b) Spalagadama, as *Spalahora-putra.*

40 *BMC,* p. 70, no. 15 , p 71, no. 17 , *ASIR,* 1912-3, p 47, no. 15 , 1928-9, p. 65, no. 18 , Banerjea, *DHI,* p 135

41 Rapson thinks that Azes of Arachosia should be identified with Azes II (*CHI,* p 573) , for a criticism of this view, *JRAS,* 1947

From these facts the inference is inevitable that king Vonones had a brother named Spalahora who may have governed as his viceroy. It also appears that Spalahora must have died during the life-time of Vonones, and was succeeded in the viceregal office by his son Spalagadama.

We also possess similar coins struck by one Spalirises as "*brother of the king*", with the Kharoṣṭhī legend, *mahārajabhrata dhramiasa Spalirisasa*. Again, other coins exhibit Spalirisa, as king on his own account, with the Kharoṣṭhī legend *mahārajasa mahatakasa Spalirisasa* The king referred to in the first of these types can hardly be any other than Vonones and the legitimate inference seems to be that Spalirisa was a second brother of Vonones, who survived both Spalahora and Vonones, and succeeded the latter on the throne.

Two types of coins, again, exhibit on the reverse the Kharoṣṭhī legend, *Maharajasa mahatakasa Ayasa,* and on the obverse the name of Spalirises in Greek characters. These coins prove that Spalirisa, after his accession to the throne had been ruling conjointly with one Aya or Azes. This Azes has been identified with king Azes I of Taxila, the successor of Maues, because his coins are closely related to the issues of the rulers of the Vonones group

SUCCESSORS OF MAUES

Marshall thinks, however, that after the death of Maues there was a Greek revival in Taxila under Hermaues, a member of the House of Eucratides, who had been ruling in the Kabul valley. Afterwards Vonones extended his suzerainty over India and his authority was acknowledged at Taxila, where Spalahora and Spalagadama acted as his legates.[42] Tarn thinks on the other hand that after Maues Taxila was occupied by Hippostratus and Nicias.[43] The theory of Greek revival in Taxila after Maues is not supported by any cogent evidence, while Vonones' assumption of the Imperial title ap-

42 *Taxila*, i. p 51
43 *GBI*, pp. 329-30.

pears to have nothing to do with the death of Maues and he evidently assumed it independently in imitation of the title of the Parthian rulers, when that opportunity came to him. There is absolutely no evidence to think that Spalahora and Spalagadama ever ruled in Taxila.

Azes overstruck some of Hippostratus' coins and used the symbol of Athena Alkis. He appears to have ruled in the Puṣkalāvatī region and his coins have been found in the Kabul valley Azilises, the successor of Azes I, issued coins from the Kāpiśa mint of "the Zeus enthroned type" and also the type "Zeus standing with Mt. Pilusara". This shows that the Kāpiśa region had been under his sway, and the Greek ruler of the Kabul valley had possibly to acknowledge his overlordship. According to Justin, however, the Greeks were finally conquered by the Parthians This may mean that after the temporary conquest of the Kabul valley by Azes—Azilises there was a Greek revival

We have already seen Azilises was succeeded by Azes II. The name Aja or Aya (Azes) has been recognised by certain scholars in the Kalawan inscription of the year 134 (77 A.D) and in the Taxila Silver Scroll record of the year 136 (79 A D.). Dr. Sircar identifies Aya with Azes II and thinks that after the conquest of Gondopharnes Azes II took shelter among the Kuṣānas who recognised him as the *de jure,* of course not the *de facto,* king and, during the turmoil following the death of Gondopharnes, conquered the North-Western Frontier Province and the Western Punjab on his behalf[44] The interpretation is not an unlikely one though other explanation of the name Aja or Aya in the above two records is also possible. It has been stated before that the name of Azes somehow came to be associated with the Vikrama era, and, as Dr. Raychaudhuri points out, the fact that in the record of the year 136 we have reference to the establishment of the relics of the Buddha in Takṣasilā *"for the bestowal of the health on the*

44 *AIU,* p 131

maharaja rajatiraja Devaputra Kushana" probably suggests that the years 134 and 136 belong to a period when the reign of Azes was a thing of the past, though the reckoning was associated still with his honoured name.[45] On some of his coins Azes II is associated with his strategos Aspavarma who later on served under Gondopharnes, the Parthian king This shows that the rule of Azes II was supplanted, at least in the Western Punjab and portions of the N.W.F.P., by the Parthian monarch

(c) THE ŚAKA SATRAPS

Before they came to India, the Śaka kings of Taxila had been imbibed with Irano-Parthian culture and ideals, and they introduced into India the system of administration by Satraps after the Achaemenian model From the inscriptions and coins we are in a position to determine some of these satrapies while in some cases again we have a number of isolated names of Satraps, but the locality of their rule cannot be determined with any amount of certainty The most clearly ascertained centres of Satrapal government under the Śaka kings of Taxila appear to have been the following·

(i) The extreme north-western portion of the empire was possibly under the rule of the Satrap of Kāpiśa which comprised the present Kafiristan and the valleys of Ghorband and Panjsir. An inscription mentions a Satrap of Kāpiśa, who was the son of Satrap Granavhryaka.[46]

(ii) After the conquest of the Puṣkalāvatī region by Azes I a Satrap was possibly appointed to rule the region lying immediately to the west of the river Indus. Thus an inscription preserved in the Kabul Museum mentions the name of a Satrap of Puṣpapura (Puruṣapura ?) as Tiravharna.[47] The record is dated in the year 83, which if referred to the Vikrama era would give us the date 23 A D

45 *PHAI* (4th ed.), p. 378.

46 Rapson, *Catalogue*, ci ; *Ancient India*, p. 141 , *JASB*, 1924, p. 14 , *CII*, II. i pp 150-1.

47 *Acta Orientalia*, xvi. Paro, iii 1937, p 234ff

(iii) The Swat valley region was evidently under the rule of the house of Vijayamitra or Viyakamitra since the time of Menander as proved by the evidence of the Shinkot inscription[48] A member of this house, Aspavarma was a strategos under Azes II as we have already stated.

(iv) A Shahadaur inscription mentions a rājan Namijada or Damijada who was also evidently a Satrap though we do not know exactly over which province he ruled. In the first line of the record there is possibly a mention of Ayasa = of Azes showing that he was a Satrap either under Azes I or Azes II.[49]

To the east of the river Indus there appears to have been three satrapies—Abhisāraprastha, Cukhsa in Taxila and Mathura. While there is no doubt that the Satraps of Abhisāraprastha and Cukhsa were subordinate rulers under the Taxila kings, the case of Mathura appears to have been somewhat anomalous. We shall see later on that originally the Mathuran Satraps were possibly the subordinate rulers but later on they became practically independent and adopted the title of mahākṣatrapa.

(i) Cukhsa: It is generally believed that the modern Chach, a broad alluvial plain in the north of the Attock District, alongside the Indus, preserves the name of Cukhsa. We have already seen that the Taxila C.P. of the year 78 speaks of the Satrap Liaka Kusulaka and his son mahādānapati Patika, who became later on mahākṣatrapa as shown by the Section G, of the Mathura Lion Capital inscription. Marshall thinks that " in all probability it (the satrapy of Cukhsa) lay along both banks of the Indus, comprising at least the Peshwar valley on its west and most of the Hazara, Attock and Mianwali districts on the east", and may have "corresponded roughly with the old Greek sub-kingdom ruled by Antimachus II, Polyxenus, Epander etc "[50] But it seems to be doubtful whether the satr-

48 *Ep. Ind.* xxiv p. 7.
49 *CII.* II. i. pp 14, 16.
50 *Taxila,* i. p. 48 & f.n. 1.

apy was so large since Abhisāraprastha, situated in the mountains above the Taxila country,[51] comprised another satrapy.

(ii) Abhisāraprastha : In the legend of a copper seal ring found in the Punjab mention is made of Śivasena, a Satrap in the town of Abhisāraprastha[52] Another Satrap belonging to the same house may have been Śivarakṣita[53] The Indian form of the name is interesting and shows how the Śakas had been attracted towards the Śaiva faith.

(iii) Some scholars think that the satrapy of Mathura was important one and it was formed in order to keep a guard against the advancement of the Śātavāhanas who had already been in occupation of the Malwa country.[54] Coins show that the earliest of the Satraps to have the charge of Mathura were Hagāna and Hagāmasa. Their coins are related as regards both type and fabric to those of Pañcāla and the princes of Mathura. Thus it appears that Hagāna and Hagāmasa, who ruled conjointly, superseded princes like Gomitra and Rāmadatta of Mathura and the adjoining regions.[55]

Later on we find that one Rājula became the mahākṣatrapa of the place. His coins are the exact copies of the coins of Strato I and Strato II. This shows that he began his rule originally in the Eastern Punjab and later on became the mahākṣatrapa of the Mathura region. This theory is also supported by the provenance of his coins which have been found in large number in Mathura, while several small copper coins

51 *PHAI*, p 248

52 *CII* II i p. 103

53 *ib*, p. 102.

54 *Taxila*, i p. 55

55 Allan, *Catalogue*, p 183f, Plate, xxvi pp 1-6. Tárn thinks that the Śakas reached Mathura quite independently of their advance up the Indus, perhaps from Mālava across Rajputana by Ajmir (*GBI*, p. 325) Konow is of opinion that the Śaka rule in Mathura was established by chiefs who left Mālava when that country under the leadership of Vikramādıtya (c 58 B. C) asserted its independence (*JIH*, xii p 23) Both Tarn and Konow base their assumption on the evidence of the *Kālakācāryakathānaka*, which, however, has got little historical value

were recovered from the Eastern Punjab, besides a few copper specimens from Mathura of pure Indian type, with the inscription "*mahakṣatrapasa Rajubulasa*". In the Greek legends of the billion coins, he takes the title of 'the king of kings', but on the *reverse*, he is called simply Satrap with the additional title of "*Apraticakra*".[56] Konow thinks that Yuvarāja Kharaosta, who is mentioned in the first Section of the Mathura Lion Capital inscription giving us an account of the family of Rājula or Rañjubula, was the father-in-law of Rājula and was the inheritor of the position of "king of kings" after Maues.[57] If we accept this interpretation we have to admit that the dominion of Maues extended in the east possibly as far as Mathura. Thomas, however, thinks that Kharaosta was the son of Rājula[58] The interpretation of Thomas appears to be a better one for the manner in which Yuvarāja Kharaosta is mentioned in Group ii, e, seems to show that he in no way held a superior position than mahāksatrapa Rājula. Kharaosta was possibly a son of Rājula, but died during the life-time of his father and was succeeded by his brother or half-brother Sodāsa as kṣatrapa or crown-prince, and later on this Sodāsa succeeded Rājula as mahāksatrapa. There are several coins with the Kharaoṣṭhī legend "*Kṣatrapasa pra Kharaostasa Artasa putrasa*" This shows that Kharaosta left a son named Arta who later on became a Satrap, possibly under his uncle Sodāsa, and issued the above coins.

Both coins and inscriptions of Sodāsa have been found in Mathura only and from this we can possibly infer that unlike his father his dominion did not include the Eastern Punjab region This may be due to two facts; either, there was a Greek revival in the Eastern Punjab, or, Maues who was his contemporary took the charge of the whole Punjab region under his own control. As we have already seen he

56 Cunningham, *Coins of the Śakas*, p 26
57 *Corpus*, II i p. 36f.
58 *Ep.* Ind ix p 141f

is mentioned as a mahākṣatrapa in the Āmohini Votive tablet of the year 72, which, as Konow has pointed out, if referred to the Vikrama era, gives us the date 14 A D. So sometimes before 14 A D., Sodāsa became a mahākṣatrapa. Taranadāsa or Bharanadāsa who issued coins as kṣatrapa and describes himself as the son of a mahākṣatrapa may have been a son of Sodāsa[59]

III

THE PARTHIANS

From the above discussions it is clear that the Śakas, one by one, put an end to the rule of the Greeks in India proper, and only one Greek sttlement continued its precarious existence in the Kabul valley under Hermaues. It is difficult to determine exactly how their rule came to an end in Taxila and other parts of North-Western India. During the reign of Azes II the currency "suffered a sudden and surprising eclipse. The design deteriorated and the workmanship came to a very low ebb". It has been surmised that such a state of affairs happened due to "some local catastrophe such as an earthquake or plague, which had wiped out the mint and its skilled engravers".[60]

PHRAOTES

Evidently taking advantage of this calamitous situation the Parthians made an inroad into India, wiped out the Śaka rule and occupied Taxila. When Apollonius of Tyana visited Taxila in 43-44 A.D., the throne of that country was occupied by one Phraotes, evidently a Parthian as his name indicates.[61] Following Herzfeld, Tarn thinks that Phraotes was Gondopharnes for the term Phraotes was a Graecised corruption of the word apratihata which is a title of Gondopharnes on his

59 *SI*, p 29.
60 *Taxila*, i p 54.
61 *The Life of Apollonius*, ed Coneybeare, i. p. 183f.

coins[62] Marshall points out that "the title *apratihatacakra* had been used by the Satrap Rajubula in the Eastern Punjab. *B M Cat* p 67 It may be noted that Philostratus represents Phraotes as being only 27 years of age at the time of Apollonius' visit, which would mean that he was about twelve years of age when he came to the throne in A.D. 19. On all his coins, however, Gondopharnes appears as a bearded, middle-aged man"[63]

GONDOPHARNES

The famous Takht-i-Bahi inscription of the year 103 shows that Gondopharnes was a king in 45 A.D. and that his reign began in 19 A.D., because the record is dated in his 26th regnal year as well. Thus we have two Parthian kings —Phraotes (44 A.D.) and Gondopharnes (45 A.D.). From the Takht-i-Bahi record, however, it does not necessarily follow that Gondopharnes occupied Taxila in 45 A.D and it is more probable that he did so a few years later (*supra*, p. 71).

Numismatic evidences show that before he came to India Gondopharnes had been ruling as a subordinate under one Orthanges in Eastern Iran. The coins of Orthanges may be divided into two groups: (a) those which show Orthanges as the supreme ruler and Gondopharnes, with Guda or Gudana, as ruling under him: (b) those which omit the name of Gondopharnes and bear the name of Gudana alone. Rapson thinks that the second group "must no doubt be assigned to the period after Gondopharnes had succeeded Azes II in the sovereignty of N W. India".[64]

Phraotes may have been a governor of Orthanges, and we are informed that the "Satrap of the Indus" was a subordinate under him. In that case we have to assume that Orthanges was the first Parthian ruler of Arachosia who extended his suzerainty into the interior of India.

62 *GBI*, p 341.
63 *Taxila*, i p 64, f n. 3.
64 *CHI*, p 578

Gondopharnes evidently occupied Taxila after the death of Phraotes. Marshall thinks that "at its fullest extent the empire of Gondopharnes comprised Sistan, Sind (probably with Cutch and Kathiawar), the Southern and Western Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province (with much of what is now tribal territory), and Southern Afghanistan. There is evidence also that he conquered and annexed part of the Parthian dominions to the west of Sistan".[65]

Before we proceed further we want to examine critically whether the dominion of Gondopharnes was really such extensive one. The inclusion of the Peshawar District in the kingdom is proved by the find-spot of the Takht-i-Bahi record and the Aspavarman coins, while his Śaka type of coins with the type of 'king on horse-back with the standing figure of Zeus or Athene on the reverse' proves his conquest of the Śaka kingdom of the Western Punjab. If the figure of Athene can really be detected on such coins we may possibly infer that he conquered the Eastern Punjab as well. At Begram and other sites in the Kabul valley, coins of Gondopharnes have been found in large number which proves indirectly that he also conquered those regions. As we have already stated, the Chinese historian Fan-ye informs us that "Kabul fell under the rule of Parthia". It is quite likely that he put an end to the rule of the last Greek king Hermaues. Now, we have got a series of coins having on the *obverse* the "Bust of Hermaues diademed" and on the *reverse a Kharoṣṭhī* legend referring to Kujula Kadphises, Kuṣāṇa Yavuga, and on another class there is on the *obverse* the "Bust of Hermaues diademed", and a Greek legend: 'Kujula Kadphises, Kusana', while the reverse is the same as in the former class. These coins prove beyond any doubt that there was an alliance between the Greek king Hermaues and the Kuṣāṇa chief Kujula Kadphises. The first class shows that evidently at the beginning Kujula Kadphises was a subordinate partner in the alliance while the

65 *Taxila*, i. p. .60

second class shows that later on he was placed on the same footing with the Greek lord.[66] The alliance was evidently formed against the attack of the Parthian king Gondopharnes who however became victorious and annexed the Kabul valley to his empire Konow reads in the Takht-i-Bahi record the name of *erjhuna Kapa*= prince Kapa, whom he identifies with Kujula Kadphises or Kadphises I. The full reading as restored by Konow stands as *erjhuna Kap (sha)sa* The restoration is quite probable and it is not unlikely that after Gondopharnes' conquest of the Kabul valley, there was friendly relationship between the Parthian king and the Kuṣāna leader. If our interpretation be accepted then we have to assume that Gondopharnes' conquest of the Kabul valley preceded the execution of the Takht-i-Bahi record of 45 A.D. and also possibly preceded his occupation of the Taxila country. Gondopharnes, as we have already seen, began his career in Arachosia and it is not unlikely that he conquered the Kabul valley while he was still a subordinate ruler under the Suren Orthanges. His conquest of the Śaka kingdom also may have thus begun from the west through the Khyber Pass. From Philostratos it appears that Phraotes, the predecessor of Gondopharnes on the throne of Taxila, enlisted the service of certain barbarians to guard his kingdom against other barbarians. It is not unlikely that his ultimate aim was to guard his kingdom against an attack from the Kuṣāṇas as well as from Gondopharnes.

Both Rapson and Marshall think that Gondopharnes conquered Seistan and part of the Parthian dominion to the west of Seistan For this they depend on the fact that Gondopharnes issued "a silver coinage of the Arsacid type (*B. M Cat.* Pl xxxii, no. 10) and that this particular symbol is found countermarked on coins of the Parthian Orodes I and Artabanus III".[67]

There however remains some doubt whether the suzerainty

66 Tarn thinks that these are pedigree coins, *GBI*, p. 338 f , cf. *JIH*, xii p 29.
67 *Taxila*, i p 60, f n. 3.

of Gondopharnes extended over Cutch and Kathiawar. The Lower Indus valley may have passed under his rule and the Satrap of the Indus who acknowledged the authority of Phraotes may have transferred his allegiance to the latter's successor. For his theory (that the empire of Gondopharnes included Cutch and Kathiawar) Marshall has depended on the fact that Sapedanes (a subordinate ruler under Gondopharnes) "may possibly be the prince whom the *Periplus* calls Sandanes and who from the indications given in that work appears to have had his dominions in the region of Barygaza and Surāṣṭra".

Now, the account of the *Periplus* runs as follows:

> "The city of Calliena (Kalyāna) in the time of the elder Saraganus became a lawful market town; but since it came into the possession of Sandanes the port is much obstructed and Greek ships landing there may chance to be taken to Barygaza (Broach) under guard".[68]

From the above account it does not at all follow that Sandanes[69], was in possession of the port of Barygaza. On the contrary, the *Periplus* gives definite indications that Barygaza was the port *par excellence* of the kingdom of Nambanus whose identification with the Śaka king Nahapāna appears to be beyond any doubt.[70]

For the administration of the vast kingdom under his rule Gondopharnes followed the Parthian model of appointing several vassal or sub-vassal kings under his control Rapson thinks that (i) his nephew Abdagases was probably his viceroy in Eastern Iran, (ii) the Strategos Aspavarman was in charge of the Swat valley region[71]

(i) Marshall points out that the coins of Abdagases may

68 *The Periplus* p. 43.

69 For various theories about the identification of Sandanes, *infra*, Ch. 5.

70 *JRAS*. 1946 p 170

71 *CHI*, pp 577-81

be divided into two groups, the earlier ones of billon similar in types and style to the billon coins of Gondopharnes, issued from the Taxila mint, and the later ones of copper issued from Seistar On the basis of the above evidence it has been held that Abdagases was at first the viceroy or sub-king, if not of Taxila, somewhere in the eastern part of the empire and later on became the governor of Irañ.

(ii) The strategos Aspavarman was possibly the military governor and was given the task of keeping away the barbarian Kuṣāṇas who were now growing in power day by day

There are coins bearing the portrait and symbol of Gondopharnes and the names respectively of Sapedana and Satavastra with the title 'Great King, King of Kings'. Marshall thinks that they were sub-kings under the Parthian monarch in the region of Cutch and Surāṣṭra,—a theory which can hardly be accepted. As Rapson says the title "is only one degree inferior to the most lofty title assumed by Gondopharnes, viz., 'Great King, Supreme King of Kings'.[72] Such a style can only mean that even in the reign of Gondopharnes, the allegiance of the governors to the suzerain was becoming merely nominal. We do not know however the district over which Sapedana and Satavastra ruled.

ST THOMAS THE APOSTLE

We are fortunate in getting a few details of the reign of Gondopharnes apart from the dry ones supplied by the archaeological sources. The apocryphal *Acts of Judas Thomas the Apostle* in its Syriac version contains the story of the conversion of Gondopharnes into Christianity by the Apostle St Thomas. Even if we may doubt the historicity of the account it shows at any rate how the name of the Parthian monarch became celebrated in far off lands. Others who scent history in the above legend have come to the following conclusion:

(i) "There is good early evidence that St. Thomas was the apostle of the Parthian empire; and also evidence that he

72 *CHI,* p. 580.

was the apostle of 'India' in some limited sense, —probably of an 'India' which included the Indus valley, but 'nothing to the east or south of it".

(ii) "According to the Acts, the scene of the martyrdom of St. Thomas was in the territory of a king named, according to the Syriac version, Mazdai, to which he had proceeded after a visit to the city of a king named, according to the same version, Gudnaphar or Gundaphar".

(iii) "There is no evidence at all that the place where St. Thomas was martyred was in Southern India; and all the indications point in another direction. (According to some versions St. Thomas was martyred in Calamina which has been identified wrongly by some scholars with Kalyāna near Bombay)".

(iv) "We have no indication whatever, earlier than that given by Marco Polo, who died in 1324, that there ever was even a tradition that St. Thomas was buried in Southern India"[73]

SUCCESSORS OF GONDOPHARNES

We have already seen that the Sapedana—Satavastra coins demonstrate the fact that the Parthian empire was a loose federation of semi-independent vassal chiefs who nominally owed allegiance to the sovereign. In such a state of affairs as long as a strong personality remains at the centre things go on smoothly, but in case of a weak personality the different units naturally become virtually independent and a chaos follows Such became the condition of the Parthian empire after the death of Gondopharnes. While giving an account of Indo-Scythia, the *Periplus* states: "Before it (Barbaricum) there lies a small island and inland behind it is the metropolis of Scythia, Minnagara; it is subject to Parthian princes who are constantly driving each other out".[74]

The disintegrated political condition of the Parthian empire

73 *IA*, xxxii. (1903, p. 151).
74 *The Periplus*, p. 37.

is reflected by the evidence of coins also. According to Lohuizen de Leeuw, Gondopharnes was succeeded by his nephew Abdagases, who was, however, soon driven out and took shelter in the court of Parthia, and he was followed in India by Pakores.[75] None of the coin legends of Abdagases bear the Imperial title and hence it is difficult to think that he succeeded Gondopharnes. From the numismatic evidences we can possibly make the following brief outline:

(a) Abdagases was the viceroy in Eastern Iran, and after the death of Gondopharnes the region possibly passed under Sanabares.

(b) Pakores, whose coins are of the Seistan pattern possibly became the successor of Gondopharnes in the region to the west of the Indus. The paucity of his coins proves evidently that he had a very short reign. Whether his sway extended also over Taxila is not certain.

(c) The strategos Sasas became independent in the Swat valley region, which was his home district, and possibly later on occupied Taxila.

(d) Some scholars think that before Taxila passed under Sasas it had been for a time under Sapedana—Satavastra who acknowledged Pakores as the overlord. But the evidence of coins on this point is not very clear.

While thus the Parthian empire was passing through a crisis, Taxila and the neighbouring region was visited by a deadly plague.[76] Thus utter confusion prevailed everywhere and taking advantage of the situation the Kuṣāṇas appeared in India soon after 60 A.D. which ultimately led to the establishment of an empire in North India under their hegemony.

75 *SPIH*, p. 361.
76 Taxila, i. p. 65.

CHAPTER IV

THE KUSANAS

I

THE EARLY KUṢĀNA KINGS

Excavations at Begram have unearthed a large number of coins of the Parthian king Gondopharnes, but none of his successor.[1] This evidently shows that the region of the Kabul valley passed under the rule of a different line after the death of Gondopharnes. On the other hand, the Panjtar Stone inscription of 64 A.D. shows that the Kuṣāṇas had established their rule in the Peshawar district.[2] From the Chinese accounts, we learn that the Kuṣāṇa king Kadphises I "invaded Ngan-si (Parthia) and took possession of the territory of Kao-fu (Kabul). He also overcame Pou-ta and Ki-pin (Kashmir) and became completely master of these kingdoms."[3] Thus we may infer that sometimes after the death of Gondopharnes and before 64 A.D the region lying to the west of the Indus including the Kabul valley passed under the rule of the Kuṣāna king Kadphises I.

The rise of Kadphises thus marks an epoch in the history of the Kuṣāṇas. The Kuṣāṇas were a branch of the Yueh-chi, who, as we have already seen, began a movement towards the west, when about 165 B.C. they were attacked by the Hiung-nu king Chi-yu.[4] After various vicissitudes of fortune they ultimately came and settled in Ta-hia or Bactria about 145 B.C.[5] In 128 B.C. the Chinese ambassador Chang-kien visited their

1 For excavations at Begram, see Ghirshman, *JA*, 1943-5, pp. 59-71; *Begram*, 1946.

2 *CHI*, I, p. 584; the Panjtar record, like the other pre-Kaniska Kharoṣṭhī records may be ascribed to the Vikrama era. cf. *Select Ins.* p 126.

3 Chavannes, *T'oung-Pao*, serie, tome VIII, 1907, p. 187.

4 *supra*, p. 61.

5 *cf.* supra, pp. 19ff.

country and found them already well-settled in the land. The political condition of this part of Asia is thus described in the *Report* of the ambassador.

> "North of this country (Ta-yuan = Ferghana) is Kang-ku (Sogdiana); in the west are the Ta-Yueh-chi; in the south-west is Ta-hia (Bactria); in the north-east are the Wu-sun; and in the east Han-mi and Wu-tien (Khotan)".[6]

The same *Report* states elsewhere that when the Yueh-chi were driven by Hiung-nu, "they fled to a distant country and crossed to the west of Yuan, attacked Ta-hia and conquered it. Subsequently they had their capital in the north of the Kui-shui (Oxus) and made it the court of their king".[7]

Kujula Kadphises

We next hear of the Yueh-chi in the *Hou Han-shu* or "*The Annals of the Later Han Dynasty*" composed by Fan-ye who died in 445 A.D. Fan-ye gives the following account:

> "In old days the Yueh-chi were vanquished by the Hiung-nū. They then went to Ta-hia and divided the kingdom among five 'Yabgous', viz., those of Hieou-mi Chouang-mi, Kouei-Chouang, Hi-touen and Tou-mi. More than hundred years after that, the Yabgou of Kouei-chouang (Kushan) named Kieou-tsieou-kio (Kozoulo Kadphises) attacked and vanquished the four other 'Yabgous' and called himself king; the name of his kingdom was Kushan".

From coins we come to learn of various obscure rulers who may have belonged to one or other of the five Yueh-chi principalities referred to above. One of them Miaos (or Heraos) was the first "chieftain among the Yueh-chi to issue a Greek coinage. Other such kings were Hyrcodes, Spabaris, Sapaobizes etc.".[8] The rise of Kujula Kadphises evidently put an end to

6 F. Hirth, *JAOS*, 1917, p 95; *Shi-ki*, 123, 22.
7 *Shi-ki*, 123, 29
8 *GBI*, p. 305

the rule of these petty kings and the Yueh-chi now became strong enough to aggrandise themselves at the cost of the neighbouring kingdoms.

Naturally the tribe was attracted towards India and we can possibly determine the different stages in the process of this advancement. We have already referred to the coins jointly issued by Hermaues, the last Greek king of the Kabul valley, and Kujula Kadphises who played a subordinate role at that time. Next the Kuṣāṇa chief entered into friendly relationship with the Parthian king Gondopharnes, as proved by the mention of *erjhuna* (prince) *Kapa* in the Takht-i-Bahi record[9] His Indian campaign evidently began after the death of Gondopharnes. Allan has pointed out that Kujula copied the coins of Claudius, who reigned from A D. 41 to 54.[10] This would show that Kujula was ruling even after 41 A D. at least, and thus may well have been a contemporary of Gondopharnes.

Marshall points out that the coins of Kujula Kadphises have been found in so large number in Sirkap that it would be natural to infer that he added Gandhāra and Taxila to his other conquests, referred to by the author of the Hou Han-shu.[11] It is further surmised that part of these conquests may have been achieved by his son Vima Kadphises, during his life-time, for the Chinese sources inform us that Kujula died at an advanced age of more than 80 years and further that Yen-kao-chen or Vima Kadphises conquered Tien-chu or India. So if Taxila really passed under the rule of Kadphises I, the conquest of the place must have been effected by his son. Evidently in his old age Kadphises could not physically undertake the arduous task of military campaigns which were left to be undertaken by his grown up son. The Kalawan (near Sirkap, Taxila) Copper plate of the year 134 = 76 A.D[12] shows, however, that Taxila was subsequently lost to the Kusāṇas.

9 *CII*, II i p 62.
10 *CSHI*, p. 74
11 Marshall, *Taxila*, i. p 67.
12 *Ep Ind*. xxi. p. 259.

and Vima had to conquer the countries to the east of the Indus afresh. The Kalawan record makes no mention of the Kuṣāṇas and it is dated in the era of Azes i.e., the Vikrama era, which, as we have already said, became associated with the name of Azes at a later date, just as the era of Kaniṣka became associated with the name of the Śakas, and the Gupta era with the name of the Maitrakas of Valabhi. The non-mention of the name of the Kuṣānas show that in 76 A.D the country of Taxila was outside their jurisdiction. This has led many scholars to think that Vima Kadphises came to the throne after 76 A.D. and then conquered the country of Tien-chu, as he is credited in the Chinese records

VIMA KADPHISES

Konow and Marshall think that Vima Kadphises came to the throne in 78 A.D.[13] and he was the originator of the Śaka era running from that date There is, however, no proof that he was the originator of an era, for "no inscription or coin of this monarch contains any date which is referable to an era of his institution'.[14] Ghirshman, on the other hand, puts his date at 95 A.D. We shall discuss later on the basis of Ghirshman's theory to show that it is really untenable. Here it may only be pointed out that in case of such late dates for Vima Kadphises, it "would be unexplainable why Wima Kadphises imitated the standard of the Roman aureus of Augustus and his immediate successors which in the meantime had been depreciated by Nero The standard of Wima Kadphises in that case would not tally any more (sic) with that of the western tradesman which would be quite impracticable".[15]

It is indeed difficult to determine exactly when the reign of Kujula Kadphises came to an end and when his successor Vima Kadphises came to power, though from the above discussions it is clear that he must have ruled before the starting

13 Marshall, *l c.*, p 69 ; *CII II* i . p lxvii
14 *PHAI*, p 463
15 *SPIH*, p 366

of the Śaka era. As we have already stated the Panjtar inscription of 64 A.D. shows that the Peshawar district was under the rule of a Kuṣāṇa monarch. If, as Marshall thinks, that this conquest was carried on by Vima Kadphises on behalf of his father then we may assign the record to the older Kadphises. In this connection we may discuss the evidence of two coins having the following legend on them:

(a) *Maharayasa Rayatirayasa Kujula Karakaphasa sacadhramathitasa*

(b) *Maharajasa rajatirajasa Kusanasa ya(vugasa ?)*

Marshall thinks that the class (a) coins should be attributed to Vima Kadphises. "The reason for associating them with Vima rather than with Kujula Kadphises is that the word *kara* has been interpreted as the equivalent of *kala,* which was used at a somewhat later date in Turkestan with the meaning prince, and if this interpretation is correct, it would seem that the coins were issued by Vima Kadphises as crown-prince during his father's life-time. In that case the coin figured in R.U.C. no. 226, which bears the legend *Kujula kara dhramathidasa,* may also have been issued by the crown-prince Vima".[16] It has been suggested that the coins of class (b) probably belonged to Kujula Kadphises.[17] The title *Yavuga* shows, however, that they were issued by some subordinate ruler and hence they should also properly be attributed to Vima Kadphises.

Vima Kadphises may have conquered Gandhara and Taxila on behalf of his father. The *Hou Han-shu* informs us that "Kieou-tsieou-kio died at the age of 80. His son Yen-kao-chen ascended the throne. He conquered Tien-chu (India) and there set up *generals,* who governed in the name of the Yueh-chi".[18]

16 Marshall, *l.c*, pp. 67-8. Rapson thinks that Kujula Kara Kadphises was a third Kuṣāṇa king (*CHI*, p. 582); contra, *CII*, II i pp. lxiv-lxv.

17 Konow also maintains a similar view (*CII*, II. i. p. lxv); *contra,* Rapson, *CHI*, p. 581.

18 *JRAS*, 1903, p. 24; *JDL*, i. p. 72; Marshall, *l.c.*, p. 67. Marshall thinks that he set up "an army leader" (*sing*). The original text shows that the *sing.* or *plural* may both be indicated. Ed. Specht uses the *plural* "generals".

Smith gives the following note on the reign of this monarch: "The Indian dominions of Kadphises II certainly extended to the Ganges, and probably at least as far south as Benares. His empire extended westward to the frontiers of Parthia, and included the whole of the countries now known as Afghanistan, Afghan Turkistan, Bukhara, and parts of Russian Turkistan".[19]

Though there is no positive evidence to show that the empire of Vima Kadphises was so extensive there may be some basis for the above assertion as the subsequent discussions would show. We have to remember the fact that the reign of Vima must have come to an end before 78 A D. and that he governor his empire through his *viceroys*, as stated by the Chinese chronicles.

II

A DISCUSSION OF KANIṢKA'S DATE

While the Kalawan inscription of the year 76 A.D., referred to above, shows that the Kuṣāṇas had no jurisdictions over Taxila, the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription[20] of the year 136= 78/9 A.D. shows their rule over the place. Now this record presents us with two problems: (a) the inscription refers to '*maharajasa rajatirajasa Devaputrasa Khusanasa*' which is the peculiar form of description of the Kaniṣka group of kings who ruled after the Kadphises group, but not of the latter; (b) as Vima's rule ended before 78 A.D. when Kaniṣka I came to power who was the originator of the era which starts from that year, the record, being dated in the Vikrama era, cannot be ascribed to him.

Thus while the use of the Vikrama era shows that the Taxila Silver Scroll record cannot belong to the Kaniska group, the use of the expression *Devaputra* in it shows at

19 Smith, *JRAS*, 1903, p 31. Thomas has shown that the *Han records* mention the conquest of Central India by Vima Kadphises or Kadphises II (*NIA*, vii. 1944). Large number of his coins have been found in Mathura.

20 *Ep. Ind.* xiv. p 295.

the same time that it cannot belong to the Kadphises group. This naturally leads us to assume that it was issued by a king who did not belong to the either group

Thus we may arrive at the following facts about the early Kuṣāṇa kings of India:

(a) Before 64 A.D. they conquered the region to the west of the Indus, as proved by the Panjtar record.

(b) As crown prince Vima Kadphises might have conquered Taxila, and later on when he succeeded his father he conquered the interior of India and appointed viceroys to rule over the different parts of his empire. His reign evidently came to an end before 78 A D. As Kujula died at an advanced age of more than 80 years, it is but natural that the reign-period of his son Vima was a short one.

(c) About 76 A.D. there was some trouble in the Kuṣāṇa empire and Taxila may have become independent of Vima Kadphises, either under its own local ruler or under one of the viceroys of Vima Kadphises.

(d) In 78/9 A.D. Taxila was under the rule of a Kuṣāṇa king who did not belong either to the Kadphises or to the Kaniṣka group. The king evidently was one of the viceroys of Vima who declared his independence, but who did not venture to put his own name on the record. He may be identified with the nameless king of the Soter Megas coins. We have a gold coin of Vima giving him the title Basileus Basilion Soter Megas.[21] On the basis of the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription, it may safely be assumed that the viceroy, after he became independent, similarly used the title of Soter Megas but not his own name.[22] This, further, shows that Kadphises II was possibly alive in 79 A.D., for otherwise, the ruler of the Taxila Scroll may have given his own name in the record.

At this stage we have to discuss the important question

21 *NC*, 1934, p. 232.

22 *cf.* CII, II i. p. lxix: "The Eras in the Indian Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions" *Acta Orientalia* (1925), 65.

whether Kaniṣka, who is generally regarded as the successor of Vima Kadphises, came to the throne in 78 A.D., in view of the fact that Vima was alive in 79 A.D., and if so when the rule of Vima came to an end.

The date of Kaniska is one of the greatest puzzles of ancient Indian history. The western scholars generally put his accession sometimes between 120 and 144 A.D.,[23] while the Indian scholars think that the Śaka era of 78 A.D marks the initial year of his reign. Recently, Ghirshman has proposed the year 144 A.D. as the date of Kaniṣka's accession. His inference is based on the findings at the ancient city of Begram in Eastern Afghanistan. The coins of Vāsudeva, the last king of the Kaniska group to rule into the interior of India, were the latest of the Kuṣāṇa remnants found at that place, and it has been supposed that as the city was destroyed by Shahpur I, the Sassanid king of Iran, in the period between A.D. 241 and 250, the last year of Vāsudeva would fall in that period From the inscriptions it is clear that Vāsudeva I reigned from the year 74 to 98 of the era started by Kaniṣka, and thus the initial year of that era would fall c. 144 A.D., which consequently marks the year of Kaniṣka's accession. On this view, Ghirshman gives us the following chronological table:

Kaniṣka	c.144-172 (?)
Huviska	c 172-217 (?)
Vāsudeva I	c 217 (?)-241
Vāsudeva II	
Kaniska II	
Vāsudeva III	

Ghirshman's theory, however, appears to be unacceptable for the following reasons:

(a) Vāsudeva, whose coins have been found at Begram, cannot be identified with Vāsudeva I for the provenance of his epigraphic records proves beyond doubt that his empire was confined to the U.P region with Mathura as its centre

23 Appendix II

and as the coins attributed by Ghirshman to Vāsudeva have not been found in the U P, it is clear that the two Vāsudevas are different personages. From the Chinese sources we learn that the king of the Ta-Yueh-chi named Po-tiao or Pu-ra-dieu (Vāsudeva) sent an embassy to the Chinese Empéror in 230 A.D.[24] This king was evidently the Vāsudeva whose coins have been found at Begram and he evidently solicited the help of the Chinese Emperor against the Sassanids.

(b) There is no convincing proof that Begram was destroyed by Shahpur I and hence any theory built on the synchronism of Shahpur I with Vāsudeva appears to be a defective one.

Most of the western scholars, as already stated, are now disposed to think that Kaniṣka began his reign sometimes between 120 and 134 A D., and not in 78 A D The relevant arguments in favour of the view are thus summarised by Marshall:

"My own view, as already indicated, is that Kujula drove the Parthians out of the Kabul valley about A D. 50, when he was between 50 and 60 years of age; that his son Vima then carried his conquests into Gandhāra, the Punjab and Sind, and eventually succeeded his father in or about A D 78. Vima's reign may then have lasted into the opening years of the second century A D, after which I surmise that there was an interval of a couple of decades or so before Kanishka succeeded him. During this interval there seems to have been some disintegration of the Kushan power, but it is possible that *one or more*[25] viceroys under the name of Soter Megas continued to rule in India on behalf of a Kushan overlord

"Apart from what has been said above about the reigns of Kujula and Vima Kadphises, there are other grave objections to making Kanishka founder of the Śaka era of A.D. 78. One of these is that for the thirty years between A D. 73 and 102, Panchao, the famous Chinese general, was pursuing his

24 Vide *infra*, Ch vi.
25 Vide, f.n 18 above

career of unbroken conquest in the west, which added the kingdoms of Shen-Shen, Khotan, Kucha and Kashgar to the Chinese Empire. Clearly, therefore, it could not have been during this selfsame period and in these same regions that Kanishka was also winning those great victories which enabled him to extend his dominions to the east of the Tsung-ling mountains and caused the tributary Chinese princes west of the Yellow river to send him hostages. Anotther equally cogent objection is that the *Hou Han-shu Annals,* which cover the period A.D. 25 to 125 and up to the latter date show an intimate knowledge of what was happening in neighbouring countries to the west, give us a precise account of the reigns of Kujula and Vima Kadphises but make no mention of the more famous Kanishka. It was the testimony from Chinese sources that, in the main, led Sylvan Levi, Fleet, and other distinguished scholars to push back the date of Kanishka to 58 B C, but since my discoveries at Taxila have proved beyond question that Kanishka followed the two Kadphises, and put this theory entirely out of court, the conclusion seems inevitable that he could not have risen to power until after A.D 125." [26]

We have purposely given above such a long quotation as it raises some interesting issues. *First,* the theory that the Kaniṣka group of kings preceded the Kadphises group and that Kaniṣka was the originator of the Vikrama era of 58 8.4. can no longer be maintained.[27] *Secondly,* the evidence of the Chinese Annals regarding the campaigns of Pan-chao should be considered very critically in determining the date of Kaniska. Now, the Chinese account on the campaigns of Pan-chao, as summarised by Levi, runs as follows:

"Pan-tchao's victorious campaigns, pursued for thirty years (73-102 A.D.) without interruption, at this very time restored Si-yu (the West) to the empire, and carried Chinese arms beyond the regions explored by Tchang-kien, as far as the confines of the Graeco-Roman world. By 73, the king of Khotan had

26 Marshall, *l.c.* p. 69f.
27 Appendix II. p. 95.

made his submission; several kings of that country followed his example, and gave their eldest sons as hostages for their fidelity. Kashgar, immediately after, returned to obedience. The two passes by which the way to the south debouches into India were in the hands of the Chinese .... The Yue-tchi had not renounced their previous supremacy without a struggle. In the year 90 the king of the Yue-tchi sent an ambassador to demand a Chinese princess in marriage. Pan-tchao, deeming the request insolent, stopped the ambassador and sent him back. The king of the Yue-tchi raised an army of 70,000 horsemen under the orders of the viceroy *Sie*. Pan-tchao's troops were affrighted at the number, and his general had much trouble to reassure them; however, he made them see that the enemy, worn out by a long march, and by the fatigues endured in crossing the Tsoung-ling mountains, was not in a condition to attack them with advantage. Sie was vanquished, and the king of the Yue-tchi did not fail to send every year the tribute imposed upon him."[28]

In the above summary, an item important for our purpose, has been left out. It is stated that in 73 A.D., the Chinese general Pan-chao nominated a king for Kashgar by deposing the old ruler. The deposed prince now solicited the help of the Kang-ku (Sogdians) and through them wanted the assistance of the Yueh-chi.[29] This brought the Yueh-chi king in the field of Central Asiatic politics. The Chinese general at first used to send rich presents to the Yueh-chi ruler, but later on by 90 A.D., the relationship was strained.

In 73 A.D. Kaniṣka certainly had not come to power, and hence the Yueh-chi ruler from whom the deposed ruler of Kashgar solicited help should be identified with Vima Kadphises. The question now arises, who was the Yueh-chi king who solicited the hand of an Imperial Chinese princess in 90 A.D.? We have already seen that Kujula Kadphises died at an age of more than eighty years, and hence in 90 A.D., Vima was, if he

28 *IA*, 1903, p. 421-2

29 *Toung Pao*, II vii, pp. 216f; *CII* II. i. p. lxxi.

at all had been alive, too aged a man to have a new wife. Further, we have already seen that Vima could not have been a king by the eightees of the first century A D,[30] and hence the Yueh-chi chief must have been a successor of Vima Kadphises, and he appears to be no other than Kaniṣka, or one of Vima Kadphises' viceroys who had declared his independence as proved by the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription referred to above

The Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang gives the following account: "When Kaniska reigned in Gandhāra, his power reached the neighbouring states and his influence extended to distant regions As he kept order by military rule over a wide territory reaching to the east of the Tsung-ling, a tributary state of China to the west of the Yellow river through fear of the king's power sent him prince as hostages" Commenting on it, Watters observes: "In the *Life* also there is only one hostage and he is a son of a Chinese Emperor .. The story in the *Records* evidently supposes the reader to understand that the hostages were the sons of a ruler of a feudal dependency of China or of rulers of several such states Here also I think there is properly only one hostage prince and the use of the plural in the latter part of the passage is perhaps a slip".[31] Kaniska's sway in Central Asia was, however, of short duration, for in the *"Legends of Kaniṣka's Death"*, the king is represented as saying: "I have subjugated three regions; all men have taken refuge with me, the region of the north alone has not come to make its submission".[32]

The above account thus in no way contradicts the story of Pan-chao's success, as has been supposed by several western scholars. Kaniṣka was evidently defeated by the Chinese general. But what concerns us here is the fact that this defeat took place after 90 A D, and after he had begun his reign in

30 Vide, f.n. 15 above.
31 Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, Vol I., pp 124-5.
32 *JRAS*, 1912, p 674, *EHI*, p. 285.

the region of Gandhāra. The question, therefore, arises—when did Gandhāra come under his sway?

Konow thinks that the Peshawar Casket inscription of Kaniṣka is dated in his first regnal year.[33] The reading of the date appears to be hardly correct.[33a] On the other hand, the Zeda and the Sui Vihar inscriptions of the year 11 are the first records showing Kaniska's connection with the western and north-western part of India. The fact that both the records belong to the same year is significant In this connection, it should be noted that we have an inscription of Kaniṣka of the year 2 from Kosam and another from Sarnath of the year 3. These evidences may be interpreted in the following manner:

> that Kaniṣka originally came to power in eastern India as a governor under Kadphises II and later on declared his independence and conquered in his eleventh year another governor of the same monarch who assumed an independent status in 78/9 A.D., as proved by the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription of the year 136, and who issued the Soter Megas coins;
>
> or
>
> that Kaniska really came to power in the western region and conquered Taxila in the end of year 79 A D. and the Ganges-Jumna valley in 80 A.D.

In any case, there is nothing in the history of Pan-chao's campaign which cannot be reconciled with the theory that Kaniṣka started his reign in 78 A D. The Chinese account that the struggle between Pan-chao and the Kusāṇa chief took place after 90 A D. seems to corroborate directly the statement of Yuan Chwang that Kaniṣka extended his arms in Central Asia after he began reigning in Gandhāra.

While thus we may accept the view that Kaniṣka's reign

33 *CII* II i p 137
33a *The British Museum Quarterly* 1964, pp 39 ff

began in 78 A.D. there are some difficulties in accepting the theory that the same must have started sometimes between 120 and 134 A.D., as maintained by many western scholars. In the first place, the continuous reckoning in the records of the kings of the Kaniṣka group, viz., Kaniṣka 1-23, Vāsiṣka 24-28, Huviṣka 28-60 Vasudeva 67-98 shows that Kaniṣka was the originator of an era. But there is no proof that any era ever started between 120 and 134 A.D. It may be argued, however, that the era of Kaniṣka really started sometimes between these two dates and that later on it fell into disuse. Thus we must find out some other evidence, besides the founding of an era, to determine the date of Kaniska. And that evidence is possibly furnished by the Junagadh inscription of Rudradāman of 150 A.D.

The Andau inscription of 130 A.D. shows that Rudradāman was ruling as mahākṣatrapa in conjunction with his grandfather Caṣṭana,[34] while the Junagadh inscription[35] shows that he carried extensive conquests in North and South India on or before 150 A.D. There is, however, one significant point in the record. It does not speak of the Kuṣānas, though he is said to have conquered the Sindhu-Sauvīra region (Multan and Jharavar) and the "proud and indomitable Yaudheyas" who originally occupied the territory of Johiyabar on the river Sutlej. All these formed parts of the Kuṣāṇa empire, and the non-mention of the Kuṣānas can only be explained by the supposition that their power was already eclipsed for the time being and Rudradāman did not conquer any territory from their hands

If we now turn to the epigraphic records we find that there is no inscription of the dynasty for six years, from the year 61 to 66 both inclusive.[36] In other words, there was some eclipse

34 Vide, *infra*, Ch. v

35 *Ep Ind* viii p. 42ff

36 In *Ep Ind* xxx, pp 181ff D. C. Sircar has edited the Mathura image inscription of Vāsudeva of the year 64 or 67 The reading of the date is not certain In any case there still remains unaccounted for four years if not six

of the Kuṣāṇa power during this period. Thus the period extending from the year 61 to 66 must have fallen between 130 A.D and 150 A.D., when Rudradāman carried his conquests in North India, and this does not tally if we place the accession of Kaniṣka any time between 120 and 134 A.D. This is a very strong point why we should place the accession of Kaniṣka in 78 A.D.

As already stated, the Taxila Silver Scroll inscription mentions a Kuṣāṇa ruler of 79 A.D., who did not belong either to the Kadphises or to the Kaniṣka group. Thus it is evident that about 78 A.D., there arose rival claimants for the supreme power in the Kuṣāṇa dominion and by crushing such rivals, Kaniṣka became at last supreme.

III

THE REIGN OF KANISKA I

EXTENT OF THE EMPIRE

Kaniṣka was the greatest king of his dynasty. Though his inscription has been found in as far east as Benares, doubts have been expressed whether his dominions extended beyond the Mathura region It may be pointed out here that from the Tibetan sources we learn that king Kaniṣka led an army into India and overthrew the king of Soked, i.e. Sāketa or Ayodhyā.[37] The Chinese translation of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanā-manditikā*, which was composed shortly after the reign of Kaniṣka states that "in the family of Kiu-sha there was a king called Chen-Kia-ni-tcha (Devaputra Kaniṣka). He conquered Tung-T'ien-tchou (Eastern India) and pacified the country".[38] Eastern India, in the Buddhist annals signified the region to the east of Ku-chu-weṇ-ki-lo or Kajaṅgala near the Rajmahal hills in the Eastern Bihar.[39] If then the Chinese account is

37 *Ep Ind* XIV. p. 142; *IA*, 1903. p. 382.
38 *IA*, 1903 p. 385.
39 *CAGI*, p xliii

to be believed, Kaniṣka possibly conquered a portion of West Bengal as well. But unfortunately there is no definite archaeological evidence in support of the theory. Only the following objects of the Kuṣāna age have been found from the state: (a) a copper coin of Kaniṣka found at Tamluk in the Midnapore district; (b) a gold coin of Vāsudeva found in Bogra district (E. Pakistan); (c) a base metal coin of the same king found in the Murshidabad district; and (d) another coin of Vāsudeva found at Mahāsthān, and one at Maldah. From these evidences only it will be utterly improper to think that any part of Bengal was included within the empire of Kaniṣka. It is, however, not unlikely that he really led an expedition into the province but did not annex it within his empire proper.

It has already been stated that the empire of Kaniṣka extended in the east up to Benares, as we have from Sarnath one of his inscriptions dated in the year 3. We may now note the large number of Kuṣāna coins found in the Eastern U.P. in contrast to the few pieces found in Bengal and Bihar: (a) 105 Kuṣāṇa copper coins found in monastery at Sahet Mahet; (b) 100 copper coins of Kaniṣka and Huviṣka found in a place in the Azamgadh district; (c) a hoard discovered at Azamgadh containing coins of Kaniṣka and Huviṣka with a few Ayodhya coins of "cock and bull" type; (d) similar coins found in village Nai in the district of Azamgadh. These discoveries when considered in the back ground of the Benares record prove that Eastern U P. definitely formed a part of the dominion of Kaniṣka[40]

Thus from the find spots of his epigraphic records we can infer that the present U. P., Punjab, North-Western-Frontier Province, Northern Sind were certainly included within the empire of Kaniṣka The Sanchi Museum inscription of the year 22 shows that in the south his sway extended as far as the Malwa region where his son Vāsiṣka acted as one of his viceroys. From the *Si-yu-ki*, it is clear that Kashmir was also

40 *IHQ*, xxvii p 294; *ib* xxix p 212-3.

a part of his kingdom, and, as we shall see later on, the scene of his religious activities.

Levi thinks that the sway of Kaniṣka also extended over the North-Western part of the Deccan. He identifies Sandanes mentioned in the *Periplus* with Candra or Candana, Chinese Chen-tan, a royal title given to Kaniṣka. Further, he thinks that Tong-li of the Chinese historian should be identified with Drāviḍa and thus concludes that between 22 and 170 A.D. the Yueh-chi were the rulers of different principalities in the Deccan.[41] The theory, however, does not tally with the known epigraphic evidesces of the dynasty.

KANIṢKA AND NAHAPĀNA

Rapson makes Kṣaharāta Nahapāna who ruled over Ujjayini, Western Mahaiastra etc., a subordinate rulet under the Kuṣāṇas, because one of the Nāsik inscriptions of Nahapāna contains, according to Rapson, " the important information that the rate of exchange between the Kārṣāpana and the gold coin of the period, the *Suvarna*, was as 1 to 35. The reference here must surely be (according to Rapson) to the contempoiary gold currency of the Kuṣāṇas, the standard of which was apparently that of the Roman Aureus".[42] The mere mention of Suvarṇa or gold coins cannot at once refer to the currency of the Kuṣāṇas, for Suvarna as a coin was prevalent in India as early as the Vedic times. Prof. Bhandarkar has adduced still another argument to connect the Kṣaharātas with the Kuṣāṇas. The Nasik Cave inscription, no. 12, of Nahapāna's son-in-law Usavadāta contains the line ". . . . *data cānena akṣaya-nivi-Kāhāpaṇa-sahasrāṇi trīṇi* 3000 *saṃghasa cātudisasa ye imasmin lene vasāmtāna(ṃ) bhabisaṃti civarika Kuśāṇamule ca*". Bhandarkar observes that the name Kuśāna "appears to have been given to the silver coinage of Nahapāna, because he issued it for his overlord, who must have been known as kuśaṇa i.e., Kuṣāṇa". He further connects this Kuṣāna with the Kuṣāṇa

41 *JA*, 1936, pp. 61-121.
42 Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. clxxxv.

sovereign referred to in the Taxila Scroll inscription of the year 136, and thinks that he can be no other than Kujula Kadphises or Kadphises I. The sense of the passage does not admit of Bhandarkar's interpretation. Kuśānamula here evidently refers to *expenses of outside life* as pointed out by Senart. Further, there are objections to the equation Kuśana to Guṣaṇa or Kuṣāna.[43]

We have made the above discussions particularly because, as we shall see later on, Nahapāna was a contemporary of Kaniṣka I, and did not belong to the first quarter of the second century A.D. as it has been supposed by many scholars. There is, however, absolutely no evidence to show that he was in any way subordinate under Kaniṣka I.

CENTRAL ASIAN HOSTAGES

It has already been shown that Kaniṣka extended his authority over Central Asia, and "kept order by military rule over a wide territory reaching to the east of the Tsung-ling". A tributary state of China to the west of the Yellow river sent him the royal princes as hostages. "On the arrival of the hostages", we are informed, "Kaniska treated them with great courtesy and provided them with different residences according to the seasons. The winter was spent in India, the summer in Kapis, and the spring and autumn in Gandhāra. At each residence, a monastery was erected. . . . . .".[44] Yuan Chwang further states that the place where these hostages were kept during the winter came to be known as Cīna-bhukti. It is further related how peaches and pears were unknown in this district and the parts of India beyond, until they were introduced by the "China Hostage". Hence the peaches were called *Chīnāni* and the pears *Chīnarājaputra*.[45] Kaniṣka's empire of Central Asia came to an end under the pressure of the Chinese general Panchao sometime after 90 A.D.

43 Chattopadhyaya, *SI*, p 34.
44 Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, i. p. 124
45 Bagchi, *India and China*, p. 64.

SUBORDINATE RULERS

The vast empire of Kaniska appears to have contained several subordinate states ruled by local kings who evidently acknowledged his supremacy. Thus the Sarnath inscription of Kaniṣka of the year 3 mentions the mahākṣatrapa Kṣarapallāna and the kṣatrapa Vanaspara. Vogel points out that the image, on which the inscription is engraved, shows the style of the Mathura school of art and the material is the red sand-stone of the Agra quarries All these, according to Vogel, point to the conclusion that the donors of the images had their home at Mathura, where as early as the reigns of Rañjubula and Soḍāsa, a school of sculptors flourished, which was strongly influenced by the Graeco-Buddhist art of Gandhāra.[46] Kṣarapallāna evidently belonged to the house of Soḍāsa and acknowledged the suzerainty of Kaniṣka, and his son Vanaspara was evidently associated with him in matters of administration

Numismatic evidences again disclose the existence of at least three more subordinate states. Allan points out that the Mitra coins of Kauśāmbī possibly came to an end with the first century B.C, while "the very common coins with the types of Dhanadeva with incomplete and apparently meaningless legends represent the last stage of the coinage of Kauśambī, and must belong to the early centuries A D"[47] Evidently Dhanadeva and his successors became subordinate rulers under Kaniṣka whose inscription of the year 2 shows his sway over the Kauśāmbī region.

Similarly, the coins of Ayodhya may be divided into three distinct groups: the first, with punch-mark symbols belong to the third century B C.; the coins belonging to Mūladeva, Viśākhadeva, Dhanadeva, Śivadatta and Naradatta have been assigned to the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era; the third class of coins mentioning the names of kings like Satyamitra, Āryamitra, Kumudasena, Ajavarman and others.

46 Vogel, *Ep Ind* viii p 173
47 Allan, *Catalogue*, p xcvii

"probably covered the first two centuries A D."[48] showing that the rulers of the last group were subordinates under Kaniṣka and his successors.

Many such instances of the existence of local autonomous states under Kaniṣka may be gathered from the evidence of the tribal coins in the *Catalogues* of Cunningham and Allan But we propose to note here one special type, that of the Yaudheyas. Allan in his *Catalogue*[49] classifies them as follows: (a) those belonging to the late second and first centuries B C. and (b) those copper coins which can be assigned to the second century A D. The absence of any Yaudheya coins of the first century A D. is very significant. It shows that the Kuṣāṇas did not allow them to enjoy local autonomy like the rulers of Ayodhyā, Kausāmbī and other places This accounts for the fury of the tribe against the Kuṣāṇas and in the second half of the second century A D. we find that they dedicated their kingdom to the war-god Kārtikeya and took an important part in overthrowing the alien rule from the heart of the country. (*Vide* Ch. VI).

LITERARY PERSONAGES OF THE TIME

The above discussions clearly show that Kaniṣka was undoubtedly a great conquerer. His achievement in the time of peace also was not negligible. He was a great patron of learning and famous men of letters like Nāgārjuna, Aśvaghoṣa Māṭhara and Caraka adorned his court[50] Sanskrit language possibly got a new impetus of life in his time. As Konow says, "Sanskrit seems to have spread over the territory where Kharoṣṭhī was used at an early date .... Sanskrit stanzas are occasionally found in Kharoṣṭhī documents from Chinese Turkistan, and together with Sanskrit the Brāhmī alphabet begins to replace Kharoṣṭhī"[51]

48 *ib.* p xc
49 *ib.* p. cxlvii-ci
50 *IA*, 1903, p 382ff.
51 *CII*, II i. p. lxxix.

KANIṢKA AND BUDDHISM

Kaniṣka's name, however, is specially associated with the religion of Śākyamuni. According to the *Si-yu-ki*, Kaniṣka is said to have convoked a Buddhist Council at Kashmir, which was presided over by the venerable Vasumitra. It is said that after the deliberations were finished, Kaniṣka caused them to be "written out on copper plates, and enclosed them in stone boxes, which he deposited in tope made for the purpose."[52] In later Tibetan books also we find a reference to this council with somewhat different details In Paramārtha's *Life of Vasubandhu*, the credit for convening the council is given to Kātayānīputra. It may be noted here that in Pali traditions this council has been completely ignored.

Foucher thinks that the earliest Buddha figure appears on certain coins of Kaniṣka[53] among the numismatic records. Tarn, however, holds that the first Buddha figure appeared on a coin of Maues, and further that "there is a series of coins struck by Kujula Kadphises after the conquest of the Paropamisadae which show on the obverse a seated Buddha with one hand raised in benediction, and on the reverse a standing Zeus, which must be the Zeus of Kapisa".[54] Tarn's theory, however, has not been universally accepted.

The grand stūpa that Kaniṣka built at Peshawar, his capital, has drawn admiration from all Cunningham and Foucher have identified Shahji-ki-Dheri, two large mounds outside the gang gate of the Peshawar city, with this stūpa. From Al-biruni's account it is clear that he knew the stūpa and the monastery built by the king at Kaniṣkapura.[55]

52 Watters, *l c.* I. p. 271.

53 Foucher, *L'Art greco-bouddhique de Gandhāra*, Vol. II pp. 439, 519.

54 *GBI*, p 403.

55 *cf. The British Museum Quarterly*, 1964 p 44

OTHER ACTIVITIES

While giving an account of Kāpiśa the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang has recorded a curious story about Kaniska. Thus it is stated that "above 200 li north-west from the capital was a great Snowy Mountain on the top of which was a lake, and prayers made at it for rain or fine weather were answered The pilgrim then narrates the legend about this lake and its Dragon-kings. In the time of Kanishka the Dragon-king was a fierce malicious creature who in his previous existence had been the novice attending an arhat of Gandhāra. As such in an access of passion and envy he had prayed to become a Nāga-king in his next birth, and accordingly on his death he came into the world as the Dragon-king of this lake. Keeping up his old bad feelings he killed the old Dragon-king; and sent rain and storm to destroy the trees and the Buddhist monastery at the foot of the mountain. Kanishka enraged at the persistent malice of the creature proceeded to fill up his lake On this the Dragon-king became alarmed and assuming the form of an old Brahmin remonstrated earnestly with the king. In the end the king and the Dragon made a covenant by which Kanishka was to rebuild the monastery and erect a tope; the latter was to serve as a lookout, and when the watchman on this observed dark clouds rising on the mountain the gong was to be at once sounded, whereupon the bad temper of the Dragon would cease. The tope still continued to be used for the purpose for which it was erected".[56]

In the above story we evidently find one of the many legends that clustered round the name of Kaniṣka in the later days. Can we infer from above that Kaniṣka built in Kāpiśa something like a modern meteriological tower to study the climatic conditions ?

Kalhana in his *Rajataraṅginī* also mentions the name of Kaniṣka:

"Then there ruled in this very land the founders of cities

56 Watters, *l.c.*, i pp. 127-8.

called after their own appellations the three kings named Huṣka, Juṣka and Kanıṣka'.[57]

Thus the Kashmir region was very intimately associated with the Kuṣāna monarch. Curiously enough in his *Geographike* Ptolemy also calls the Kuṣāna kingdom of his time by the designation of *the Kingdom of Kaspeiraioi* or the kingdom of Kashmir. We shall discuss more of it later on.

IV

THE SUCCESSORS OF KANIṢKA I

Kaniṣka died in c 101 A.D. after ruling for 23 years. He was succeeded by his son Vāsiṣka, who as crown-prince acted as his viceroy in the Malwa region. Vāsiṣka ruled for a brief period of four years only, i.e., upto c.105 A.D. Possibly after his death there was some trouble in the dynasty, for as we shall see later on,[58] the epigraphic records show that there was a partition of the empire, and while Kaniska II, the son of Vāsiṣka, was ruling in the west in the year 41 = 119 A.D., Huviṣka, the son of Kaniṣka, ruled from c.106 A.D. to c.138 A.D. Marshall, however, thinks that as Huviṣka bore the lesser title of *rajatiraja* between 40 and 60, it may be inferred that "after Vāsashka's death, Huviṣhka, who was probably his brother or uncle, acted for some years as regent on behalf of his son, Kanishka II, and when the latter came of age in the year 39 or 40, was associated with him as co-emperor for a short while, but on his premature death succeeded him as sole emperor".[59] There are, however, some difficulties in accepting the theory. In the first place, there is absolutely no epigraphic or numismatic evidence to show that Kaniṣka II and Huviṣka ever ruled as co-emperors, as we find in the case of the Śaka kings of Taxila Secondly, if we critically study the

57 "*The Stream of Kings*", Trans R S Pandit, p 23

58 Appendix I

59 Marshall, *Taxila*, i p. 71.

evidence of the *Geographike* of Ptolemy, it would be clear that there was some confusion in the vast empire once ruled by Kaniṣka I.

It is generally believed that Ptolemy composed *Chap* vii. Pt. i, of his work containing an account of *India intra Gangem* sometimes between 130 and 140 A D though his materials for the description of North India might have come from earlier sources.[60] In Fg. 47, Ptolemy states that the region extending from the country of the Pandoouoi around the Bidaspes or Hydaspes, the Jhelum, "towards the east are possessed by the Kaspeiraioi" as far as Modoura, the city of the gods[61] Levi has shown that the kingdom of "Kaspeiraioi" undoubtedly refers to the empire of the Devaputras or the Kuṣānas.[62] In this description, we have to note the following points:

(a) The empire as described by Ptolemy extends from the Eastern Punjab to Mathura in the east;

(b) The region lying to the west of this kingdom is divided into several small kingdoms

After Kaniṣka, no epigraphic record of the Kuṣānas have been found in the region to the east of Mathura, and this tallies with the description of Ptolemy. The Eastern U P. may have been under the sphere of the influence of the dynasty, but the absence of the epigraphic records clearly shows that it was not directly under its rule. Again, it is only on the supposition that Huviṣka and Kaniṣka II had been ruling contemporaneously, the latter in the Western Punjab and the former in the interior of India, that we can explain the implication of Ptolemy's account Evidently, there was a struggle for the throne in the dynasty, when petty chiefs in the western part of the empire became virtually independent, till they were again brought under obedience by Huviṣka after the death of Kaniska II

60 *AHD,* p 40.

61 *Ancient India as described by Ptolemy* ed McCrindle, p. 124.

62 *JA,* 1915. p 91

From the Tibetan account also it is clear that there was some trouble in India about this time. Thus it is stated that an expedition in India was undertaken "shortly after 120 A.D by the Khotan king Vijayakīrti in connection with king Kanika and the king of Guzan".[63] The date shows that this king Kanika must be identified with Kaniṣka II. Possibly there was some rebellion in India— and this is proved by the description of the small kingdoms in the North-Western Frontier Province and the Western Punjab in the *Geographike* of Ptolemy—in the vast empire left by Kaniṣka I, and it required the skill of the three kings to crush it. In the *Si-yu-ki* also we find that Kashmir revolted after the death of Kaniṣka:

> "After Kaniṣka's death a native dynasty had arisen in Kashmir, and its sovereign had become a persecutor of Buddhism. Hereupon the king of Himatala, who was a Śākya by descent and a zealous Buddhist, determined to drive the cruel Kṛtiya king from his throne and restore Buddhism. By a stratagem, cunningly devised and skilfully carried out, he succeeded in killing the king of Kashmir. He then banished the chief minister of the court, and reinstated Buddhism as the religion of the country, and then returned to his own kingdom"[64]

Watters points out that the term Himatala is translated in a Chinese note by the expression "*Foot of Snow Mountain*". Yule thinks that "we find a trace of the word Himatala in the name of one of the still existing feudatory provinces of Badakshan, Daraim, or Dara-i-aim". It is not unlikely that it was a part of the kingdom of Khotan under Vijayakīrti. Thus the Khotan king actively helped the Kuṣāna monarchs of India in suppressing rebellions. That Kashmir was brought to subjugation is proved by the statement of Kalhana that Huviṣka built a town in that country. After the death of Kaniṣka II,

63 *infra*, Appendix III
64 Watters, *l.c.*, i. p 278.

the two parts of the Kuṣāṇa dominion were again united under the suzerainty of Huviṣka as proved by the Wardak Vase inscription of the year 51 belonging to the reign of the monarch.

It has already been stated that Huviṣka ruled up to the year 60 = 138 A.D. and for seven years after him there is no record of the dynasty [65] Vāsudeva began his reign in c 145 A.D. and his rule continued up to 176 A.D., though it is not impossible that "he may well have been reigning, however, for several years after the date"[66] given in the inscription of the year 98. As the records of this king are found in the Mathura and the adjoining regions, it has been inferred that he ruled over a small kingdom in Western U.P. It is, however, very curious that a large number of coins, more than eleven times as numerous as the coins of Huviṣka, bearing the name of Vāsudeva, have been found in Taxila.[67] But it is difficult to determine precisely whether they belonged to the successor of Huviṣka having the name of Vāsudeva or to a later member of the dynasty of the same name called Po-tiao in Chinese records as reigning about the year 229 A.D. The latter alternative seems to be more probable in view of the fact that the successor of Huviṣka was very probably not associated with the western Punjab region as no epigraph of his reign has been found in that country as against his several inscriptions found in the western U.P region. In the present state of our knowledge it must be held that Vāsudeva I was the last of the dynasty of Kaniṣka to rule into the interior of India. The evidence of coins and the Chinese accounts, however, disclose the fact that the Kuṣāṇas continued to rule in the North-Western Frontier Province and the Punjab for several centuries to come. It is difficult to determine exactly what relationship these rulers bore to Vāsudeva I.

65 Vide, f.n. 36 above
66 Marshall, *Taxila*, p 72
67 *ib*. p. 71.

APPENDIX I

Some Observations

on

THE KANISKA GROUP OF KINGS

From the epigraphic records, we get the following dates of the kings of the line of Kaniṣka:

Kaniṣka	yrs	1-23
Vāskuṣāṇa	"	22
Vāsiṣka	"	24-28
Huviṣka	"	28-60
Kaniṣka II	"	41
Vāsudeva	"	64/67-98

Three things should be noted in the above chart:

(a) The date of Vāskuṣāṇa overlaps with that of Kaniṣka;

(b) The date of Kaniṣka II overlaps with that of Huviṣka;

(c) There is no record of any Kuṣāṇa king for 4/7 years from 60 to 67.

(a) A fragmentary inscription in the Sanchi Museum[1] refers to Vāskuṣāṇa and the year 22. Lohuizen de Leeuw has shown that it is a barbarous telescopic form of Vāsiṣka or Vāsudeva and Kuṣāṇa.[2] The record then may be assigned to Vāsiṣka and was issued when he was a governor under Kaniṣka.

(b) An inscription from Ara (near Attock, W. Punjab) of the year 41 refers to one Vājheṣka-putra Kaniṣka.[3] This Vājheṣka may be identified with Vāsiṣka, who succeeded Kaniṣka I. The epithet "*maharajasa rajatirajasa Devaputrasa Kaisarasa*" given to the name of this Kaniṣka II shows that he was an independent sovereign. This shows that after

1 *Sanghi Catalogue*, p 30-1.

2 *SPIH*, p. 314.

3 *Ep Ind* xiv. p 143, *CII*, II, i p 165.

Vāsiṣka there was a partition of the Kuṣāṇa empire, and while Huviṣka succeeded to the eastern part, Kaniska II became the king of the western division. The Wardak Vase inscription of Huviṣka of the year 51 shows that his power extended in the west as far as the Kabul valley. This suggests that sometime after the year 41 Kaniṣka II died and his empire came under Huviṣka

(c) For 4/7 years extending from 138 to 142/5 A.D. we have no Kuṣāṇa record in India, and it is very difficult to explain the affair After 146 A.D. when fresh light comes, the Kuṣāna empire appears to be confined within the Mathura and the adjoining regions. This proves that the empire suffered diminution during the aforesaid age. As it has been already stated, the Kuṣāṇas are not mentioned in the Junagadh inscription of 150 A.D., though Rudradāman conquered the Sindhu-Sauvīra country which certainly formed a part of the Kusāṇa empire in the earlier days. There is no reason to think that the successors of Kaniṣka were reduced by Rudradāman under his vassalage, for in that case the fact would surely have been mentioned in the Junagadh record. In the present state of our knowledge it is difficult to determine exactly the nature of the catastrophe through which the empire passed immediately after the death of Huviska.

Divergent views have been expressed regarding the number of kings belonging to Kaniska's dynasty Smith and R. D. Banerjee think that Kaniṣka of the Ara record was Kaniṣka I and that his sons Vāsiska and Huviṣka were viceroys under him[4] Allan is of opinion that Kaniṣka was succeeded by Huviska as king, while Vāsiṣka was Kaniska's viceroy and never ruled independently as no coins of him seem to have survived. Similarly, it is maintained that "the absence of coins indicates that a second Kaniṣka, whose name has survived in inscriptions, was not a paramount sovereign but a viceroy of Huviska', who was succeeded by Vāsudeva.[5]

4 Smith, *The Oxford History of India*, p. 130-1.
5 *CSHI*, p. 79.

Thus there is a very strong view that Vāsiṣka never ruled as an independent king. Ghirshman also thinks that Vāsiṣka predeceased Kaniṣka.[6] The Sanchi Buddhist Image inscription of the year 28, however, describes Vāsiṣka as *maharaja-rajatiraja-Devaputra-Sāhi*. This title could only have been adopted by a supreme ruler.

Similar also is the case with Kaniṣka II whose title shows that he was not a viceroy, but a supreme ruler. The view of Smith and R. D Banerjee that he is to be identified with Kaniṣka I is nullified by the fact that in the Ara record he is described as a son of Vājheṣka, i.e., Vāsiṣka, who can be no other than the son of Kaniṣka I of the same name.

Dr. Lohuizen de Leeuw adds two more kings to the Imperial Kuṣāna line, Kaniṣka III and Vāsudeva II. Her views are as follows:

(a) The date of the Mathura inscription of the year 14 mentioning Mahārāja Devaputra Kaniṣka,[7] should be taken on palaeographical grounds as dated in the year 114 with the sign of the hundred omitted, and thus we get one Kaniṣka III ruling in A.D. 192.

(b) Similarly, the date of the Sanchi Museum inscription of the year 22 should be read with an added hundred and thus the king Vāskuṣāṇa mentioned in the record would be ruling in A.D. 200. This Vāskuṣāna, according to her, was Vāsudeva II.[8]

In spite of her palaeographical arguments, we do not prefer the theory of "*added hundred*", for we have no direct evidence that such a system ever existed in ancient India, especially during the time of the Kuṣāṇas. We prefer to identify Kaniṣka of the above Mathurā record with Kaniṣka I and Vāskuṣāna with Vāsiṣka.

6 *Begram*, p. 143.
7 *Ep Ind* xix, p 96.
8 *SPIH*, p 314

APPENDIX II

THE DATE OF KANIṢKA I

We have already tried to show that Kaniska was the founder of the Śaka era of 78 A D. Here we propose to discuss the different theories regarding the date of this king

(1) The view that Kaniṣka was the founder of the Vikrama era of 58 B C. was first advanced by Cunningham (*ASI*, ii. 1871, pp. 68n, 159ff; iii. p. 31), and then accepted by Fleet (*IA*, 1904, *JRAS*, 1906, pp 979ff ; 1913, pp. 95ff, 965ff; 1914, pp. 992ff), and Kennedy (*JRAS*, 1912, pp 665ff, 981ff , 1913, pp. 369ff, 661ff, 1054ff)

(2) From a study of the Chinese records, Levi concluded that Kaniṣka ruled at the end of the first century B C. and the beginning of the first century A D. (*JA*, 1896, pp. 444ff ; 1897, pp 1ff).

It is difficult to accept any of the above theories, for as Allan has pointed out, the gold coinage of Kaniṣka was suggested by the Roman solidus and thus the Kuṣāna monarch can hardly be placed long before Titus who ruled from 79 A D. to 81 A D. As regards the Chinese sources referred to by Levi, it may be pointed out that Ed. Specht in *JA*, 1897, pp. 152ff. critically discussed the same account and concluded that Kaniṣka must have ruled at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D.

(3) In *JRAS*, 1913, pp. 947ff, Waddell adduces archaeological grounds for believing that Kaniṣka ruled in first century A.D., while Vogel came to the same conclusion also on the grounds of palaeography (*Ep. Ind.*, viii, pp. 173ff).

We also agree with Waddel and Vogel, but as the inscriptions of the Kaniṣka group of kings show a continuous reckoning proving the fact that Kaniṣka was the originator of an era, we are in favour of associating him with the Śaka era of 78 A.D.

(4) Oldenberg (*JPTS*, 1910-1, pp. 1ff), Ed. Specht (*JA*, 1897, pp. 152ff), A. M Boyer (*JA*, 1900, pp 526ff) and Stein (*IA*, 1905, pp. 77ff) favour the view that Kaniska flourished at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century A D. (This theory practically agrees with the view we have adopted in these pages).

(5) Most of the western scholars believe that Kaniṣka began his reign in the second century A D. Konow thinks that he came to power after 125 A D. and the Kaniṣka era begins with the year 128-9 A.D Smith thinks that Kaniṣka ruled sometime between 120 and 160 A D. (*EHI*, pp 271ff), while Kimura holds that he ruled between 140 and 180 A D. (*IHQ*, i. pp 415ff). According to Ghirshman, Kaniṣka's reign began in 144 A D (*Begram*). Marshall also thinks that Kaniska could not have come to power "*until after* A D. 125"

The second century A.D. theory goes against the evidence of the Junagadh inscription of mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman, for if we assume that Kaniska began his rule about 125 A D Rudradāman's mastery over the Sindhu-Sauvīra region becomes incompatible with the evidence of the Mohenjo-daro and the Sui Vihar records of Kaniṣka proving the latter's jurisdiction over the same territory. Further, as we have already stated Rudradāman's conquest of North India must have been undertaken at a time when the Kuṣāna power must have been at a very low ebb and when the Yaudheyas have reasserted their independence. Again, as we have already stated,, Kaniṣka was certainly the originator of an era and we know of no era starting in the second century A D.

(6) Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that Kaniṣka came to the throne in 248 A.D. and was the founder of the Traikuṭaka-Kalacuri-Cedi era starting from that year (*JDL*, i. pp. 65ff).

(7) Sir R. G. Bhandarkar holds that Kaniṣka ascended the throne in 287 A D. (*JBBRAS*, 1900, pp 385ff).

As pointed out by J-Dubreuil the third century A D. theory for Kaniska is clearly untenable: "In fact, the reign of Vāsu-

deva, the last of the Kushāṇas, came to an end 100 years after the beginning of the reign of Kanishka. Numerous inscriptions prove that Vāsudeva reigned at Mathurā It is certain that this country, over which extended the empire of Vāsudeva, was occupied about 350 A.D. by the Yaudheyas and the Nāgas and it is probable that they reigned in this place nearly one century before they were subjugated by Samudra Gupta. The capitals of the Nāgas were Mathurā, Kāntipuri and Padmāvati". (*AHD*, p. 31). Further, as Dr. Raychaudhuri points out, this goes against the Tibetan account which makes one Kaniṣka a contemporary of king Vijayakīrti of Khotan who ruled about 120 A.D. (*PHAI*, p. 468).

(8) Fergusson (*JRAS*, 1880, pp. 259ff), Oldenberg (*IA*, x. 1881, pp 212ff) Rapson (*CHI*, pp. 581, 583ff), Sahani (*JRAS*, 1924, pp. 399ff), H. C. Ghosh (*IHQ*, iv pp. 760ff ; v. pp. 49ff) and others maintain the theory that Kaniṣka came to the throne in 78 A.D. This view has been criticised on the following grounds:.

(a) that the Śaka era was not a northern one. (*Boyer*) (As pointed out by Lohuizen-de Leeuw: "This is not true. The Śaka era was only temporarily suspended by the Gupta era and pretty soon after the fall of that dynasty the era was used again. The supposition that this was the first time that the Śaka era came into favour in North India is wrong") (*SPIH*, p 383).

(b) that if we assume that Kaniṣka came to power in 78 A.D. he would be the anonymous Kuṣāṇa king defeated by the Chinese general about 90 A.D., but this is incompatible with the evidence of the *Si-yu-ki* regarding Kaniṣka's empire in Central Asia. (We have already discussed this point and have tried to show that there is no difficulty in assuming that Kaniṣka was really defeated by the Chinese general)

(c) J-Dubreuil thinks that the Kusāṇa king referred to in the Taxila Silver Scroll record is probably Kadphises I and this proves that Kaniṣka was not on the throne in 78 A.D. (It has

already been shown that the monarch referred to in the epigraph could neither be Kadphises I nor II nor Kaniṣka. He was evidently a governor under Vima Kadphises or Kadphises II).

Thus there is, in fact, no valid argument against the 78 A.D. theory regarding the date of Kaniṣka I. We have already adduced fresh points in support of this theory.

APPENDIX III

A NOTE ON KANIṢKA II

We have already tried to show that Kaniska of the Ara inscription of the year 41 should be regarded as an independent king and that he possibly ruled contemporaneously with Huviṣka. In this connection we may note the following lines from one of the Tibetan works dealing with Li-yul, or Khotan, to which we have briefly alluded before:

"The king Kanika (or is it 'the king of Kanika' ?) and the king of Guzan and king Vijayakīrti, lord of Li, and others having led an army into India and overthrown the city of Soked (Sākota), king Vijayakīrti, obtaining many sariras, then bestowed them in that Stupa of Phru-no"

Prof. F. W. Thomas adds the following notes on the above passage:

"The reference here would certainly seem to be, however mistakenly expressed, to Kaniska, and in the Guzan we cannot fail to recognise the Kuṣāṇas of the coins and inscriptions, more especially as the form Gusana is actually recorded in two places".[1]

If we follow the above interpretation then we can see at once that about 120 A.D., the date of Vijayakīrti of Khotan, there was one Kaniska and another king of the Kuṣāṇas. This Kaniṣka, as we have already stated, should be identified with the king of the same name mentioned in the Ara record, and the question now arises who was then the king of the Kuṣāṇas as distinguished from king Kanika of the Tibetan records. He can only be identified with Huviṣka whose records extend from the year 29 to 60 of the Saka era. The account clearly establishes the fact that about 120 A.D. there was a partition of the Kuṣāṇa empire, and while king Kanika ruled in one part, the king of the Guzan = Huviska ruled over another.

We, however, do not like to press upon the Tibetan account

1 *IA*, 1903, p. 349.

too much, for other scholars have given a different interpretation of the term Guzan[2] If, however, we study the above Tibetan account in the background of the description given in the *Geographike* of Ptolemy, as already noted, we should prefer the interpretation of Thomas: Guzan = Kuṣāṇa

It is not unlikely that the venerable ăcārya Mātrceta refers to Kaniṣka II in his '*Epistle of King Kanika*' wherein the monarch is described as a scion of the Kuśa family and 'the ruler of the north'. Tāranātha asserts that this Kanika was distinguished from king Kaniṣka, though he gives an absurd and confusing account making Mātṛceta an inhabitant of Kusumapura in the time of Bindusāra, son of Candra Gupta. Evidently, Tāranātha knew that the addressee of Mātṛceta was a different person from the Great Kaniṣka and bore the same name, and was also a king of India.[3] A second Kaniṣka who ruled in India and who is associated in Tibetan tradition with king Vijayakīrti of Khotan can only be Kaniṣka II.

Prof Thomas draws our attention to the following Tibetan account which throws further light on the career of this king:

"Towards the end of his (Mātrceta's) life, king Kanika sent the messenger to invite the Ācārya, who, however, being unable on account of his great age to come, despatched an Epistle and converted this king to the doctrine".[4]

The account clearly shows that Kaniṣka II was a follower of the religion of Śākyamuni, and Tāranātha has recorded some of his activities in connection with that religion, the historicity of which may appear to be very doubtful. Similarly we are in favour of dismissing the account of Tāranātha that this Kanika, "young in years, was chosen a sovereign" in the land of Tili and Mālava.

If, however, following Levi, we identify Mātrceta with Aśvaghoṣa then we have to identify king Kanika also with Kaniṣka I for from the account of the Chinese authors it is

2 Guzan has been taken to be a place name in Central Asia.
3 *IA*, 1903, p 383
4 *ib*, p. 348

clear that Kaniṣka I and Aśvaghoṣa were contemporaries.[5] We, however, at the same time cannot ignore the fact that Tāranātha distinguishes between two Kaniṣkas while dealing with Aśvaghoṣa. Levi states: "The relations between Kaniṣka and Aśvaghoṣa were an embarrassment to Tāranātha; his chronological system obliged him to separate the two persons, and he had to invent a king Kanika, contemporary with Aśvaghoṣa, one 'whom we must consider as a different person from Kanishka'." The confusion of Tāranātha may have been caused by the fact that Aśvaghoṣa (Mātṛceta ?) was a contemporary of both the Kaniskas. This seems to be clear from the fact that king Kanika (Kaniṣka II) sent for the Ācārya towards the end of the latter's life, as it is evident from the quotation of Tāranātha given above.

5 *ib*, pp 383ff.

CHAPTER V

THE ŚAKAS OF WESTERN INDIA

I

THE KṢAHARĀTAS

The Parthian conquest of the Indus valley, as we have already seen in a previous chapter,[1] put an end to the rule of the Śakaṣ in the Punjab and the North-Western Frontier Province. It also produced an indirect result on the politics of North India. The Śakas now became scattered and a branch of them moved towards the south and ultimately carved out a kingdom in the western part of India.

Available records disclose the existence of two such dynasties —the Kṣaharātas, and the family of Caṣṭana, generally called the kṣatrapas of Surāṣṭra and Malwa. The history of these dynasties should properly form a chapter in the annals of South India since the main sphere of their political activity lay in the region to the south of the Vindhya, excepting that of Rudradāman who also conquered a considerable portion of North India. As, however, the chief centre of their power was in Malwa we may briefly note the history of the dynasties here.

Of these two dynasties, the earlier and the short-lived one was that of the Kṣaharātas, consisting of two members only, Bhūmaka and Nahapāna. Some scholars think that the Kṣaharātas may have been Pahlavas or Parthians.[2] But if we remember the fact that in the Taxila plate, Patika's father Liaka-Kusulaka is described as Cahara (ta) and as a satrap under the Śaka king Maues-Moga, we have to regard the Ksaharātas as belonging to the Scythian stock.[3] A Mathura inscription of

1 *supra*, Ch. iii pp 63ff.

2 Rapson, *Catalogue*, p civ ch *JIH*, xii p. 37.

3 *Supra*. p. 61

the first century B.C. bears the name of Kṣaharāta Ghaṭāka.[4] This shows that the Kṣaharātas had their homes in Taxila and Mathura, wherefrom they evidently migrated to the south under the pressure of the Parthians. It may further be noted in this connection that "the coins of the Kṣaharātas of the Western India have on the reverse.... arrow, thunderbolt and discus .. which recalls certain coins of Maues and Azes I, the Kings of kings of Taxila while the 'Lion-Capital' on the reverse of Bhumaka's coins is a further link with the Śaka family of Mathura".[5] Dr Raychaudhuri points out that "Kṣaharāta seems to be identical with Karatai, the designation of a famous Śaka tribe of the north mentioned by the Geographer Ptolemy".[6]

BHŪMAKA

From a consideration of the type and fabric of the coins, there cannot be any doubt about the fact that Bhūmaka preceded Nahapāna. Bhūmaka's coins have been found in Gujrat, Kathiawad and the Malwa region. If we accept the theory that the Kṣaharātas moved south under the pressure of the Parthians, we may tentatively place the beginning of Bhūmaka's reign sometime between 50 and 60 A.D.

NAHAPĀNA

We are absolutely in the dark regarding the relationship of Nahapāna with Bhūmaka. Rapson thinks that the forms of Brāhmī and Kharosthī letters on their coins, however, make a long interval between them almost impossible.[7] Thus if we think that Bhūmaka began his rule sometime between 50 and 60 A D, we cannot place the beginning of Nahapāna's reign beyond c 80 A D Now, Nahapāna has been mentioned in eight cave inscriptions. Of these six have been cut in cave no. 10 of the Pandu Lena, near Nasik, one in the Caitya cave at

4 *JRAS*, 1912, p. 121

5 *SI*, p 35.

6 *PHAI*, p 484

7 Rapson, *Catalogue*, p cviii

Karle and one in a cave at Junnar. The Nasik records give the dates 41, 42 and 45 The Junnar epigraph specifies the year 46.

THE DATE OF NAHAPĀNA

There has been great controversy regarding the era to which these dates are to be referred. Cunningham, Dubreuil, R. D. Banerjee and some other scholars are in favour of assigning them to the Vikrama era of 58 B.C. This theory has rightly been rejected by later scholars.

Following A. M. Boyer, Rapson refers these dates to the Śaka era of 78 A D. and this view has been accepted by Drs. Raychaudhuri, Sircar and others. It has been pointed out that as the Nasik inscription of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇī of the year 18 confirms the gift formerly made by Uṣabhadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, it may be inferred that the last year of Nahapāna is equivalent to the 18th year of Gautamīputra's reign, or in other words 124 A D. = the 18th year of the reign of the Sātavāhana king.[8] Thus it is clear that for determining the date of Nahapāna we have to consider first the date of Gautamīputra.

The theory of M/S. Bhandarkar that Gautamīputra and Pulumāyi ruled conjointly must now be given up.[9] Gautamīputra's empire included Ākara-Avanti (East and West Malwa), while it has been shown before that we have got an inscription of Vāṣiska from Sanchi dated in the year 106 A D. showing that the Kuṣānas still controlled the Eastern Malwa region which the Nasik inscription describes as included within the dominion of Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi. So Gautamīputra's conquest of Ākara-Avanti seems to have taken place sometime after A.D. 106 and it thus becomes difficult to agree with Dr. K. Gopalachari that Gautamīputra ruled from c.82 to c.106 A.D.[10]

8 *ib*, pp. xxvi-xxvii.

9 For a criticism of the theory, *PHAI*, p. 492f; *JRAS*, 1926, p. 644f. Gopalachari *Early History of the Andhra Country*, p 63ff.

Again, the evidence of the *Geographike* of Ptolemy clearly points to the fact that Casṭana must have held sway over a portion at least of the Avantī region.[11] The Andau inscription of 130 A.D. shows that Caṣṭana had been ruling conjointly with his grandson mahākṣatrapa Rudradāman[12] Thus sometime before this date Caṣṭana must have snatched away a portion of the Sātavāhana territory. As Rapson thinks there is no evidence that Gautamīputra lost any part of his dominion during his lifetime.[13] This leads us to think that Caṣṭana evidently occupied Ujjayinī after the death of Gautamīputra. From the epigraphic evidences it is absolutely clear that Gautamīputra ruled at least for 24 years and if, on the other hand, we think that his 18th year corresponds to 124 A.D. his death would fall in the year 130 A.D It may of course be argued that Casṭana possibly occupied Ujjayinī immediately after the death of Gautamīputra. But here we have to remember the fact that as in the year 130 A.D he had been ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman, he must have come to power before this date for we have the coins of his son Jayadāman as kṣatrapa under him[14] Thus the theory that the year 18 of Gautoamīputra's reign is equivalent to 124 A.D. seems to be improbable.

We have to note in this connection another important piece of evidence. In his Junagadh inscription of 150 A.D. Rudradāman claims that he defeated Śātakarṇi, lord of the Dakṣiṇāpatha, twice in fair fight, but did not destroy him on account of the nearness of their connection[15] Rapson thinks that this Śātakarnī was Vāśiṣṭhīputra Pulumāyi who is further identified with Vāśiṣṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarṇī mentioned in a Kanheri record as the husband of the daughter of the mahākṣatrapa Rudra). But neither in inscriptions

11 *Ptolemy*, p. 152.
12 *Ep. Ind.*, xvi. p. 23ff.
13 Rapson, *Catalogue*, p xxxviii
14 For Jayadāman's coins, *ib.* pp. 76-7.
15 *Ep. Ind.* viii. p. 42ff.

nor in the coins Pulumāyi adopts the title Śātakarṇī, and, therefore, the identification of the Śātakarṇī of the Girnar record, or of Vāśiṣṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarṇī of the Kanheri epigraph, with Puluhāyi appears to be untenable. Further, according to Ptolemy, Pulumāyi was a contemporary of Caṣtana,[16] and it is thus highly improbable that Pulumāyi married the latter's great grand-daughter.[17]

From a Karle epigraph it appears that Pulumāyi ruled at least for 24 years. Thus if we think that Gautamīputra died c.130 A.D. Pulumāyi would reign at least up to 154 A.D., which, however, is incompatible with the mention of Śātakarnī, as the lord of Dakṣināpatha, in the Junagadh inscription of 150 A.D. Dr. Raychaudhuri thinks that "Śātakarṇi is perhaps to be identified with Vāśiṣṭhīputra Śrī Śātakarṇi of a Kanheri Cave Inscription, or with Vaśiṣṭhīputra Chatarapana Śātakarṇi of a Nanaghat record. His exact position in the genealogical list cannot be determined with precision".[18] As in the Junagadh record Śātakarṇī is described as Dakṣiṇāpatha-pati, it is clear that he must have been a king of importance and may possibly be identified with Śiva Śrī Śātakarnī who ruled for 13 years according to the *Purāṇas* and was a successor of Pulumāyi on the Sātavāhana throne Thus it is clear that the Sātavāhana chronology as proposed by Rapson needs a thorough revision and the 18th year of Gautamīputra = the last year of Nahapāna's reign must be much earlier than 124 A.D.[19] This proves indirectly further that the dates in the inscriptions of Nahapāna cannot be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. Nahapāna ruled after Bhūmaka, and thus it is not unlikey that the records of Nahapāna are dated in his regnal years. This appears to be supported by the traditions preserved in the Jaina *Paṭṭavalis* and Jinasena's *Harivaṃśa,* which assign a

16 *Ptolemy*, pp 152, 176.
17 *JRAS*, 1926.
18 *PHAI*, p. 495-64.
19 For a revised scheme of Sātavāhana chronology, *see*, Ch. VI. f.n. 47.

period of 40 and 42 years respectively to Naravāhana or Nahapāna —a fact showing that Nahapāna ruled for more than 40 years.[20]

Allan is inclined to place Nahapāna much earlier. His arguments are as follows:

A Kṣaharāta satrap called Ghaṭāka is mentioned in an inscription from Mathura, while Nahapāna uses the Indian title rājā on the reverse of his coins, and rājā and kṣatrapa in a very corrupt Greek legend on the obverse, which suggests a date contemporary with Rañjubula or Rājula. His coins cannot be assigned to so late a date in the second century A.D., for this would make the interval between Nahapāna and the Mathura dynasty too great.[21]

We cannot, however, agree with this view. The Kṣaharāta satrap Ghaṭāka need not be connected with the line of Nahapāna, and further, as Allan himself states, the coins of Nahapāna and Rañjubula may have been derived from the same prototype. Under the circumstances, there is no harm if the interval between Nahapāna and the Mathura dynasty becomes "too great". The contemporaneity of Nahapāna and Gautamīputra proves beyond doubt that Nahapāna must have lived in the second century A.D. The close resemblance between the characters of Nahapāna's records and those of the Andau inscription of the time of Caṣṭana and Rudradāman of 130 A D. also supports this view

The *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* speaks of Nambanus who had the port of Barygaza (Broach) under his control. This Nambanus may be identified with Nahapāna, though Dr. Sircar thinks otherwise preferring the variant reading Mambarus or Nambarus.[22] It has been pointed out, however, that "the king of *Periplus M.E* ch. 41, is Nahapāna" and this

20 *SI*, p .47.
21 *CSHI*, p 80.
22 *AIU*, pp 178-9

no longer admits of doubt. The text, as based on the latest examination of the manuscripts, suggests the view that the name was originally Nambanus and eliminates the Mambarus of earlier texts."[23] Schoff thinks that the date of the *Periplus* is c.60 A.D. Kennedy,[24] however, points out that the *Periplus* mentions Malichos (Maliku), the king of the Nabataeans, who died in A.D. 75 and Zoscales (Za Hakale), king of the Auxumites, who reigned from A.D. 76 to 89. The *Periplus*, on the other hand, confines the Kuṣāṇas in Bactria[25] and thus it appears to point to a date before 64 A.D. In face of all these contradictory evidences, we can only conclude that the different sections of the monograph were composed at different times between 60 and 80 A.D. Thus Nahapāna must have been ruling sometime between these two dates.

Nahapāna and the Kuṣāṇas

As it has been already shown there is absolutely no evidence to prove that Nahapāna was in any way subordinate under the Kusāṇas.[26] The geographical references in the inscriptions of Usavadāta, the son-in-law of Nahapāna, show that the latter's rule extended as far north as Ajmir and Rajputana, and included Kathiawad, South Gujrat, Western Malwa, North Konkan, from Broach to Sopara, and Nasik and Poona districts. If we now turn to the inscriptions of the early Sātavāhanas, we find that a considerable portion of these territories had been under their rule,[27] and it was evidently at their cost that Nahapāna made the above conquests. In Nasik Cave inscription no. 10, Usavadāta states: "And by the order of the lord, I went to relieve the chief of the Uttamabhadras, who was beseiged for the rainy season by the Mālayas; and the Mālayas fled as it were at the sound (of my approach) and were made prisoners by the Uttamabhadras Thence I went to the Puskara lake and was consecrated, and made a donation of three thousand cows and

[23] *JRAS*, 1946, p 170.
[24] *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 827-30.
[25] *The Periplus*, ed Schoff, p 185
[26] *Supra*, p 103
[27] Gopalachari, *l.c*

a village".[28] Who these Uttamabhadras were de do not know. The Mālayas have been supposed to be either "the inhabitants of the Malaya hills in Southern India" or "the Mālavas". The latter identification is more probable.

The *Periplus* states that the capital of the kingdom of Nahapāna was Minnagara, "from which much cotton cloth is brought down to Barygaza".[29] The location of the capital has been a subject of great controversy among the Indologists, but as the *Periplus* states in connection with its description that "in these places, there remain even to the present time signs of the expedition of Alexander, such as ancient shrines, walls of forts and great well"[30] it seems that Minnagara should be located somewhere in North India

The evidence of the *Periplus* shows that in the age of Nahapāna a flourishing trade was going on between India and the western countries Commodities flowed to Barygaza (Broach) through Ozene, Paethan and Tagara (Ter). We are informed that for the king there were brought from outside very costly vessels of silver, singing boys, beautiful maidens for the harem, fine wines, thin clothing of the finest weaves and the choicest ointment.[31] This would show at once that king Nahapāna was a man of fashion with tastes of luxury. The singing boys and the beautiful maidens were evidently slaves from Europe and the adjacent countries, but it is difficult to determine their exact status in the Indian society.

The name Nahapāna is distinctly un-Indian. Naha in Iranian and Armenian means *people,* while pana in Iranian means *protege :* cf. Artaban, Darapanah etc.[32] Nahapāna's son-

[28] *Ep. Ind* viii. p 78; *Arch. Surv West Ind* iv p 99, no 5

[29] *The Periplus,* ed Schoff, p 39

[30] *ib.,* p. 39 and also p 180 For different locations of the capital, see, Fleet, *JRAS,* 1912, p 788, where Minnagara is identified with Dohad in Panch-Mahals; *IA,* 1926, p. 143, where it is identified with Junnar; Bhandarkar thinks that it was Mandasor, cf *Bomb Gaz* I p 15n For Broach as the capital of Nahapāna, *Āvaśyaka Sūtra, JBORS,* 1930, p 290, also, *IHQ,* 1929, p. 356.

[31] The *Periplus,* ed Schoff, p 42.

[32] *JRAS,* 1906, p 211.

in-law Usavadāta or Ṛṣabhadatta, however, bore an Indian name and patronised Indian religion.[33]

The End of Nahapāna

The Jogalthembi hoard has brought to light numerous coins of Nahapāna, two-thirds of which have been re-struck by Gautamīputra Śrī-Śātakarṇī, a fact which shows that the two kings were contemporaries and that the Ksaharāta ruler was conquered by the Sātavāhana king. The Nasik praśasti describes Gautamīputra as the "uprooter of the Ksaharāta race" and "the restorer of the glory of the Sātavāhana family". As among the coins re-struck by the Sātavāhana monarch there is not a single one belonging to any prince other than Nahapāna, it can safely be inferred that Nahapāna was the last prince of the Ksaharāta dynasty.

II

THE DYNASTY OF CAṢṬANA

Caṣṭana

The second family of the Śakas of Ujjayini and Kathiawad, the line of Caṣṭana, was destined to rule for centuries and played an important role in the political and cultural history of the land.[34] In the epigraphic records Castana is described as the son of Ysamotika. The term *'Ysamo'* is Scythian, meaning territory, Sk bhūmi. Hence Levi and Konow identify Ysamotika with Bhūmaka, and make Caṣṭana a relative of Nahapāna. Though this view has been ably controverted by Rapson and others, it appears that Ysamotika was very near in time to

[33] *SI*, p 93ff

[34] The dynasty of Castana uses the Śaka era in the inscriptions and coins While the Andau inscription of the year 52 = 130 A D. is the earliest known record of the dynasty, the dates on the coins of the rulers extend from the year 100 to 310 = 388 A D In the Purānas, 18 Śaka kings figure as the successors of the Andhra-Sātavāhanas The 18 Śaka kings are doubtless the kings of the dynasty Caṣṭana which ruled upto c. 255 A D, when according to Pargiter, the earliest *Matsya Purāna* account reached its completion

Nahapāna. It is not unlikely that he was a subordinate ruler in the Avanti region under Gautamīputra.

There is no doubt that Caṣṭana was an independent potentate[35] and his dynasty uses the Śaka era in the inscriptions and coins.[36] The earliest known date of the dynasty thus becomes 52 = 130 A.D. as given in the Andau inscriptions while the latest date known from the coins is 310 = 388 A.D. which falls within the reign of Candra Gupta, who extirpated the rule of the Śakas in India.

The coins of Casṭana, like those of Nahapāna, bear inscriptions in Brāhmī and Kharoṣṭhī characters, showing that he was of Northern origin.[37] The Caitya symbols on his coins, continued on the coins of his successors, also prove that he must have made some conquests at the cost of the Sātavāhanas, while the Ujjayinī symbol, and the evidence of the *Geographike* of Ptolemy[38] show his connection with the famous city.

RUDRADĀMAN

The Andau inscriptions of 130 A.D. show that Castana had been ruling conjointly with his grandson Rudradāman. As we have coins of Jayadāman bearing the humbler designation of kṣatrapa only, it is clear that by 130 A.D. he was dead, and he never thus ruled independently as mahākṣatrapa. This fact has been interpreted in a different manner by Buhler and Bhan-

[35] Dr. D. C. Sircar thinks that the line of Casṭana started as Kusāṇa viceroy of the south-western province of their empire in place of the Ksaharāta rulers with instructions to recover the lost districts of satrapy from the Sātavāhanas It has already been shown that Bhūmaka and Nahapāna were never subordinate to the Kuṣāṇas In case of Casṭana also there is no proof that he owed allegiance to anybody.

[36] J-Duhreuil thinks that Castana was the founder of the Śaka era of 78 A.D. Dr. Raychaudhuri points out that this cannot be the case, for the capital of Casṭana (Tiastenes) was Ujjayinī (Ozene of Ptolemy), whereas we learn from the *Periplus* that Ozene was not a capital in the seventies of the first century A.D. The *Periplus* speaks of Ozene as a former capital, implying that it was not a capital in its own time

[37] The head on the *Obv.* of Caṣṭana's coins closely resembles that on the coins of Nahapāna and comes from the same proto-type. For Caṣṭana's coins, Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. 72-5; for the mention of a coin of Ysamotika

[38] *Ptolemy*, p. 152.

darkar, who think that the use of the humbler designation of ksatrapa only by Jayadāman shows that 'during his reign' the power of the dynasty suffered some diminution, probably through a Sātavāhana conquest[39] The conjecture has further been supported by the statement of the Junagadh record that Rudradāman had 'won for himself the name of mahākṣatrapa' (*svayamadhigata mahākṣatrapa nāmnā*). As the Andau inscriptions show Caṣṭana and Rudradāman ruling conjointly,[40] Jayadāman never ruled independently, and therefore the question of the diminution of the power of the dynasty '*during his reign*' cannot arise. The statement of the Junagaḍh record need not be taken seriously. Such boastful empty statements are often found in Indian epigraphs.

Rudradāman was undoubtedly the greatest king of his dynasty His Junagadh record[41] furnishes us with the following facts :

(Ghsamotika), the father of Castana, Thomas, *JRAS*, 1881, p 524; cf. Rapson, *JRAS*, 1899, p 370 It is probably a coin of Caṣṭana with the name of his father, cf. Rapson, *Catalogue*, p. 71

[39] *JRAS*, 1890, p 646, *Bomb. Gaz.* I i p 34, n 5, *Early Hist Deccan*, p 29.

[40] *IA*, xlvii. p 154, n. 26 J-Dubreuil and Allan have objected to the view of conjoint rule of Castana and Rudradāman on the ground that there is no '*ca*' in the text, but they would like to supply '*grandson*' in the same. This is, however, more objectionable than the omission of '*ca*'. Dr. Bhandarkar also originally supposed that the term '*pautrasya*' had been omitted, but the construction of the text would hardly allow such an insertion R D Banerjee objected to the theory of conjoint rule on the ground that apart from the possibility of such an event in India, there is sufficient evidence in the Andau inscriptions themselves to prove that the authors of the record were quite ignorant as to the exact relationship between Caṣṭana and Rudradāman. It may, however, be noted that among the rulers of the dynasty of Castana, we find that the father and the son ruled conjointly as mahāksatrapa and ksatrapa—a fact which proves definitely that conjoint rule was prevalent in the family. Caṣṭana's son Jayadāman bears the title kṣatrapa only (never mahākṣatrapa), which proves that he ruled as ksatrapa for some times under his father, but probably died during the latter's lifetime and could not succeed to the higher office of mahākṣatrapa. After his death, Castana evidently associated with himself his grandson Rudradāman in the administration of the state.

[41] *Ep Ind* viii. p 42ff, *IA*, vii. p. 257f

(a) Election of Rudradāman as the king.
(b) Conquests made by Rudradāman, in Southern and Northern India.
(c) History of the Surāṣṭra region.
(d) Administration and personal qualities of the king

The Junagadh record states that men of all castes chose Rudradāman as protector and he earned for himself the title of mahāksatrapa. We have already stated that as the Andau inscriptions show that he had been ruling conjointly with his grandfather Casṭana the question of his election by the people cannot arise, though of course it is not unlikely that his selection by his grandfather was hailed by the subjects of his kingdom.

Rudradāman is described as being an object of devotion to the people of the countries of Pūrva and Apara Ākarāvanti (the East and West Malwa), Anūpa-nivrt or the Māhismatī region (Māndhātā in Nimad, or Maheśvara) Ānarta (the region round Dwaraka), Surāṣtra (dist. around Junagadh), Svabhra (the country on the banks of Sabarmati), Maru (Marwar), Kaccha (Cutch), Sindhu-Sauvīra (the Indus valley), Kukura (probably between Sind and the Pāriyātra mountain) Aparānta (North Koṅkan), Nisāda (in the region of the Sarasvatī and the Western Vindhyas) and others In the Nasik inscription of Vāśisthīputra Pulumāyi, Gautamīputra is described as the king of Asika, Asaka, Mulaka, Suratha, Kukura, Aparānta, Anūpa, Vidarbha and Ākarāvanti Thus it appears that Pūrvāpara-Ākarāvanti, Surāstra, Kukura in North Kathiawad, near Ānarta, Aparānta and Anūpanibhṛt were wrested by Rudradāman from some successor of Gautamīputra

Of these, Purvāpara-Ākarāvanti, Surāstra and Kukura seem to have been conquered earlier during the reign of Pulumāyi, since Castana held sway over them. It cannot be definitely determined when the rest were conquered. The Junagadh record states that Rudradāman twice defeated Śātakarṇī, the lord of the Daksināpatha, but did not destroy him on account of nearness of relationship As it has been already stated, this Śātakarṇī cannot be Pulumāyi, but probably some successor of the latter. Was it from this Śātakarṇī that Rudradāman conquered Aparānta, Anūpanibhrt and the Māndhātā regions?

The inclusion of the Sindhu-Sauvīra region, lower and middle Indus valley, within the empire of Rudradāman raises some very interesting issues. The Sui Bihar inscription of the year 11 proves Kaniṣka's mastery over this area[42] but the silence of Rudradāman's epigraph regarding the Kuṣāṇas seems to show that the dynasty had no control over the area when the conquest was made Rudradāman had also to fight the republican tribes like the Yaudheyas,[43] "proud and indomitable", who had presumably threatened him from the north The Junagadh inscription refers to *"other territory"* not specified, as conquered by his own prowess.

The history of the Surāṣṭra region, as preserved in the Junagadh epigraph, goes back to the days of the Mauryas.[44] The rock which contains this inscription has also engraved on its surface a record of Aśoka, the Maurya Rudradāman's epigraph records the restoration of the irrigation system of the Sudarśana lake, first planned by the Vaiśya rāṣṭrīya Pusyagupta under Candragupta Maurya, and afterwards improved by Aśoka's governor Yavanarāja Tuṣāspa[45] In his own time, the dam of the lake burst again and was repaired under the supervision of his governor, the Parthian Suviśākha, the son of Kulaipa. The cost of repairing it was borne entirely by the personal expense of the sovereign, and no extra tax was imposed on the people for the purpose.

We are practically in the dark regarding the system followed by the Great-kṣatrapa in the administration of his empire The

[42] *CII* II i p 141; also see, *supra,* p 79.

[43] For the Yaudheyas, *infra,* Ch vi.

[44] For an account of the rock containing the epigraph of Rudradāman, *Arch Surv. West Ind* ii p. 128 The rock, which contains this inscription, is about twelve feet in height and seventy-five feet in circumference at the base, it has engraved on its surface records of three kings belonging to three different dynasties which have ruled over the Western India (a) Aśoka, the Maurya emperor c 250 B C , (b) Rudradāman, the mahākṣatrapa the inscription being dated in the (Śaka) year 72 = 150 A.D , (c) Skanda Gupta the Gupta emperor, the inscription being dated in the Gupta years 136, 137, 139 ≐ 455, 456, 458 A D.

[45] Barua thinks that Tusāspa ruled after (*ante*) Aśoka

Junagadh record shows that the region of Ānarta-Surāṣṭra was placed in charge of the Parthian governor (amātya) Suviśākha. From this it may justly be inferred that for administrative purposes he divided his empire into several provinces and placed them under the supervision of faithful governors or amātyas In his government, the king was helped by a group of able ministers who were divided into two classes, viz, *matisaciva* (counsellors) and *karmasaciva* (executive officers).

Rudradāman claims that he did not tax the people unjustly, but still he had the treasury filled with kanaka (gold), rajata (silver), vajra (diamond) and vaidūrya ratna (cat's eye) etc. The subjects were not burdened with kara, viśti and praṇaya, but had to pay only just taxes like vali, bhāga and śūlka Here evidently a distinction has been made between the legal and illegal forms of taxation. The legal taxes vali, bhāga and śūlka were evidently paid by the people without any protest and were recoverable by the state without question.[46]

Rudradāman was thus a benevolent king with intense love for humanity. In the Junagadh record, he is described as *bhrasta-rāja-pratisthāpaka* 1. 12), the exact significance of which is not clear Like Samudra Gupta, he probably re-installed the kings whom he defeated on condition of paying him homage. Rapson thinks that the kings in question were former feudatories of Nahapāna who were dethroned by Gautamīputra [47]

Rudradāman was well-versed in grammar, politics, music and logic. He also seems to have been equally versed in prose and poetry (*gadya-padya-kāvyādīnām-pravīṇena*) The Junagadh record itself is one of the earliest epigraphs written throughout in Sanskrit and displays clearly the existence of an elaborate Sanskrit literature. It is written in prose but it shows at the same time in a most interesting manner the development from the simple epic style to that of the kāvya [48]

[46] For the connotation of the terms, *Bali, bhāga* etc. Ghosal, *Hindu Revenue System,* p 58

[47] Rapson, *Catalogue* p cxx

[48] *SI,* pp 60ff: "*Rudradāman and Indian Culture*".

There is hardly anything interesting or instructive in the dynastic history of the Śaka-kṣatrapas after the days of the great satrap Rudradāman. Our sources are very meagre and the little amount of knowledge that we have of these petty rulers can enable us only to determine the order of their succession and approximate dates but nothing of their achievements. This history we shall note in the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE DARK AGE

I

WAS THERE A BHĀRAŚIVA EMPIRE ?

With the fall of the Imperial Kusāṇas in c.176 A D we enter into what is known as the dark age of ancient Indian history, and this veil of darkness, it is believed, is not lifted till the Guptas came to power in c 319 A D.[1] Jayaswal has tried to throw fresh light on the period by assuming that the Bhāraśivas became predominant in this age and extended their rule over almost the whole of North India as well as a large tract of South India including the Andhradeśa.[2] Jayaswal's account may thus be summarised :

(1) In the Indian National War of Independence against the foreign Kusāṇa rule the Bhāraśivas took the lead and thus they occupied almost the whole of North India.

(2) The Bhāraśivas were of Nāga-origin and are mentioned in the Purānas as the Nāgas of Vidiśā and then as the Navanāgas of Mathura, Kāntipurī and Padmāvatī.

(3) The Guptas, the Vākātakas and even the Pallavas were originally feudatories (or generals) under them and later on each of these carved out their kingdoms after the decadence of the Bhāraśiva power

(4) The Bhāraśiva empire contained within itself other autonomous republican and monarchical states and they were allowed to enjoy their own internal autonomy and even the right of issuing coins in their own names.

Jayaswal thinks, in fact, that the Bhāraśivas should be considered as a great imperial power for the following reasons (a) they performed no less than ten Aśvamedha sacrifices; (b) as they were identical with the Nāgas, the *Purānas* may be utilised to prove the existence of a great Nāga empire in North India; and (c) they could successfully fight against the Kusāṇas only because of their enormous wealth and resources

[1] EHI, pp 290-92

[2] Jayaswal, History of India, 150 A D—350 A D, pp 48ff, 174

It is really difficult for us to agree with the theory as stated above for the evidences at our disposal hardly corroborate the same. As Dr Bhandarkar has pointed out the Aśvamedha sacrifice had lost its true implication about this age, and it could be performed even without any actual conquest.[3] Thus the Visṇukuṇdin king Mādhavavarman is said to have performed eleven horse-sacrifices, while Mayūraśarman, the Kadamba king performed eighteen.[4] None, however, would regard them as Imperial suzerains or even ruling over a very vast kingdom. Again, the identification of the Bhāraśivas with the Nāgas is not beyond doubt In the Vākātaka records, no doubt, Bhavanāga is described as belonging to the lineage of the Bhāraśivas,[5] but we have many such names ending in—*nāga* having at the same time hardly any connection with the Nāga stock. Even if we admit that the Bhāraśivas were the Nāgas we do not find any evidence to support their connection with the Nāgas of the *Purānas* who are represented as ruling after the Andhras and before the Guptas. The evidence of the coins shows clearly that after the fall of the Kusāṇas there appeared several petty principalities in the region once ruled by the Devaputras, while the Muruṇdas of the Scythian stock became predominant in Eastern India. The Sassanids of Iran also extended their sway over the North-Western and the Western parts of India, and the Later Kusānas who now continued to rule in the NWFP and the Punjab had to acknowledge their supremacy In any case, there is absolutely no cogent reason for believing that the Bhāraśivas became Imperial power in this so-called dark age. As Dr. Altekar states · "When considering the question of the disintegration of the Kushāna empire, we must therefore disabuse our mind of the notion that it was the Bhāraśivas of Kāntipuri who annihilated the Kushāna empire. The riddle of the disappearance of the Kushāna power from the Gangetic plain can be solved only by carefully studying the coins and inscriptions of the contemporary powers. If we do so, we shall find that the Yaudheyas, the Kunindas, the Mālavas, the Nāgas and the Maghas, who

[3] Bhandarkar, IC, i pp 114f
[4] Sircar, *Suc Sat.* pp 124f, 238f
[5] *Corpus,* iii p 236ff cf *JNSI,* v pp 21-7.

began to strike coins as independent powers in the third century, all played their own part in driving out the Kushānas".[6]

In discussing the history of this so-called dark age we must not lose sight of the fact that the Kusāṇa empire in the heart of India shrinked by stages before it finally disappeared altogether. So different forces worked at the root of this disintegration at different ages and this disintegration really began from the eastern side.

II

KAUŚĀMBĪ

The earliest defection from the empire seems to have been Kauśāmbī. Epigraphic records and the coins show that about 130 A.D., or a little earlier, when Huviṣka had still been in power, king Bhīmasena carved out for himself a kingdom in the Kauśāmbī region as proved by his Ginja (40 miles to the south of Allahabad) record[7] of the year 52 = 130 A.D There is absolutely no evidence to think that he was in any way subordinate under the Kusāṇas inasmuch as he is given the more dignified title of mahārāja We have got another record of the king from Bandhogarh (Rewa State) of the year 51 showing that Vāśisthīputra Bhīmasena really ruled over a pretty large kingdom A seal of this king found at Bhita does not prove conclusively, however, that it also was included within his kingdom, for it is not unlikely that the same had been carried to that place from outside

Mahārāja Kautsīputra Pothasiri, the son of Bhīmasena, is known from six records from Bandhogarh and his known dates are 86, 87 and 88 corresponding to A D 164, 165 and 166 Dr Altekar thinks that he possibly ruled from c 140 to c 170 A D

[6] *VGA*, p 25, *JNSI*, v pp 111-34.

[7] *Ep Ind.*, iii p 306 N. G. Majumdar and Krishna Deva think that the records of the dynasty are to be referred to the Chedi era of 248 A D (*Ep. Ind* xxiv, pp 146 & 253) Sahani thinks that the era used is the Gupta era (*ib* xviii, p 159). Konow, Marshall and Moti Chandra prefer the reference to the Śaka era of 78 A D. (*Ep Ind* xxiii p 247; *ASR*, 1911-2, p 417, *JNSI*, ii. p 95ff) The "*Saka era theory*" is now generally accepted.

(when Huviṣka and Vasudeva I were the ruling Kuṣaṇa emperors).[8] There are several coins also belonging to this king having on them the name of Prausṭhaśrī.

There are some epigraphic records that fall within the reign of Poṭhasiri but their exact interpretation causes some difficulty. Thus from Kauśāmbī we have got the records of the years 81, 86 and 87 of one Bhadramagha, who is evidently identical with Bhadradeva known from another Bandhogarh inscription dated in the year 90.[9] The evidences show that Kautsīputra Poṭhasiri had been ruling at the heart of the Baghelkhan, while simultaneously Bhadramagha had been ruling in the Kauśāmbī region and possibly later on occupied the territory of the former monarch. Dr D. C. Sircar thinks that "it seems that Bhadramagha, who may have been a younger step-brother of Bhīmasena or an elder step-brother of Praushtḥaśrī was the immediate successor of mahārāja Bhīmasena. But Praushthaśrī appears to have rebelled against Bhadramagha's authority and declared himself king in the southern part of the kingdom about the closing years of the latter's reign. Later he extended his power also over the Kauśāmbī region".[10] If, however, we identify Bhadramagha with Bhadradeva of the Bandhogarh inscription of the year 90, then it becomes difficult for us to agree with Dr. Sircar On the contrary, the epigraphic evidences would show that Bhadramagha outlived Poṭhasiri and evidently occupied the Bandhogarh region after the death of the latter. Dr. Altekar, on the other hand, thinks that Bhadramagha was the son of Pothasiri and observes that "we have got the rather strange phenomenon and finding the father Pothasiri ruling at Bandhogarh down to 166 A.D. and the son Bhadramagha administering the affairs at Kauśāmbī from 159 A.D. We can explain this riddle by the assumption that the Crown Prince Bhadra-magha managed to extend the kingdom beyond Kauśāmbī by his own valour of diplomacy and that the father permitted him to rule at the latter place as an independent ruler even in his own

[8] *VGA*, p 39.
[9] *Ep Ind.* xxiv p. 253; xviii p 160, xxiii. p 245
[10] *AIU*, p. 176

life-time".[11] The explanation, however, is hardly a convincing one. From the coins discovered at Kauśāmbī belonging to the centuries before the rise of the Imperial Guptas, we get the following names of kings : Bhadramagha, Śivamagha, Śatamagha, Bhīmavarman, Vijayamagha, Puramagha, Yugamagha, Pusvaśrī, Navika, Rudra, Dhanadeva etc. The list shows that while there are some names ending in—*magha,* there are others having altogether different forms. From this it will not be unreasonable to infer that the—magha kings belonged to one particular dynasty while the others apparently hailed from one or more different stocks If we remember the fact that Kauśāmbī had an enormous economic importance lying on the route leading to the trade-centres of the Eastern India, then it becomes easily intelligible how different powers tried to have control oyer the region and thus how different dynasties had been ruling over the place at different periods till it was incorporated within the strong built empire of the Guptas.

This leads us to think that Bhadramagha did not belong to the dynasty of Bhīmasena or Poṭhasiri. He evidently ruled originally in the Kauśāmbī region and later on after the death of Poṭhasiri extended his power in the Baghelkhand area. Śivamagha known from a Kosam inscription may have been the son and the immediate successor of Bhadramagha.[12] Gautamīputra Śivamagha is also mentioned in a Bhita seal and it is not unlikely that he also brought the Bhita region under his control A Kosam inscription of the year 107 = 185 A D. speaks of one mahārāja Vaiśravana, whose two records have also been discovered from Bandhogarh [13] We do not know whether he belonged to the dynasty of Bhīmasena, although, the form of the name seems to show that he was not a member of the Magha dynasty Thus it appears that after Gautamīputra Śivamagha the Magha power was eclipsed for the time being. Vaiśravana is described as the son of mahāsenāpati Bhadravala If, however, this Bhadravala can be identified with Bhadramagha then Vaiśravana may be supposed to have been a younger brother of

[11] *VGA*, p 40
[12] *Ep Ind* xviii. p 159
[13] *ib* xxiv, p. 146

Gautamīputra Śivamagha But the form of the name together with the fact that in the Bandhogarh inscription Bhadravala is merely described as a mahāsenāpati, and not a rājā or mahārāja, goes against such identification.

The existence of a king named Bhīmavarman is disclosed to us by two Kosam inscriptions[14] dated respectively in the years 130 and 139 corresponding to A.D. 208 and 217. He may have been the son and successor of Vaiśravana in the Kauśāmbī region.

We are completely in the dark regarding the period when kings Śatamagha, Vijayamagha, Puramagha, Yugamagha and others ruled The last ruler of Kauśāmbī appears to have been Rudra who may be identified with Rudradeva mentioned in the Allahabad inscription of Samudra Gupta.

In this connection we should consider the evidence of a Bhita seal bearing the legend "Śrī Vindhyavedhamahārājasya Māheśvara-Mahāsenāpatisrstarājyasya Vrsadhvajasya Gautamīputrasya" Marshall translates the epigraph as follows: "Of the illustrious Mahārāja Gautamīputra Vrsadhvaja, the penetrator of the Vindhyas, who had made over his kingdom to the great Lord Kārtikeya".[15] The seal probably belonged to the third century A.D. It is not clear whether this monarch started an independent dynasty at Bhita or was related to the dynasty of Bandhogarh If he originally belonged to the region of Bhita, then it must be assumed that he extended his power towards the south as his title Vindhyavedha shows. A Bhita seal of about the fourth century A D mentions one mahārāja Śamkarasimha, who may have been a successor of Gautamīputra Vrsadhvaja[16] This Bhita dynasty appears to have been conquered and extirpated by the first Gupta mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta I.

[14] *IC*, iii. p 177.
[15] For an interesting discussion on the seal, Banerjea, *DHI*, p 142
[16] *AIU*, p 177

III

THE MURUṆḌAS

We have already seen that Sāketa or the Ayodhya region formed a part of the kingdom of the Kusānas and a local dynasty ruling there, as shown by the evidence of the coins, must have acknowledged the supremacy of the foreign lords The *Geographike* of Ptolemy shows, however, that in c 140 A D the Murundas had come to power over this region, and there is no evidence that they in any way acknowledged the overlordship of the Kusāṇas. In the *Geographike,* we find, the Marundai are placed on the right bank of the Ganges, to the south of the 'Gangenai' or 'Tanganai', established in the valley of the 'Sarabos', the Sarayū of the Sanskrit texts, the Sarju or Ghogra of modern times.[17] Half a century after Ptolemy, Oppien mentions the 'Maruandien' people, as a Gangetic people living in the Indian plains.

According to the Jaina traditions, Pāṭaliputra was also under the rule of the Muruṇda kings. The *Pādalipta-Pravandha* of the *Prabhāvakacarita* relates the story how Pādalipta cured king Muruṇda of Pātaliputra of his terrible headache.[18] In the *Āvasyka-Brihadvritti* we find the mention of a Muruṇda king of Pātaliputra who sent his envoy to the king of Purisapura (Peshawar). This envoy, who put up with the royal minister at the capital, found too many Buddhist monks there. Each time the envoy tried to come out of his abode to go to the palace, he invariably met first a Buddhist monk, which he regarded as inauspicious He was informed that the capital was full of them and that he would not be able to avoid their sight [19]

Levi has pointed out that the Muruṇdas ruled in Pātaliputra in the centuries just preceding the rise of the Guptas. He draws our attention to a Chinese account[20] informing us that

[17] *Ptolemy,* pp 210, 212ff

[18] Mohonlal B Jhaveri, *Nirvāna-Kalikā of Pādaliptācārya, Intro* 10, *Pādalipta-Pravandha,* vv. 44, 59, 61

[19] cf *Mālaviya Com Vol.,* p. 184f.

[20] Levi, in his *Deux Peuples meconnus* in *Melanges Charles des Harles,* pp 176-85 has given a very interesting account of the Murundas in India

during the reign of the Wu dynasty (220-277 A.D.), the king of Fu-nan (Cambodia) named Fan-Chen sent one of his relatives Su-Wu as ambassador to India. He started from Fu-nan, passed by the mouths of the river Teou-kieou-li (Takkola) and followed the large bend of the sea-side, straight towards the north-west, entered a large gulf which bordered on a number of kingdoms, and at the end of a little more than a year reached the mouth of the river Tien-chu (India). They went up the river more than 7000 li and reached their destination. The Indian king accorded them a hearty welcome, and gave them facilities to visit the interior of the kingdom. Afterwards he sent two men, Chen-song and another, with four horses of the Yueh-chi country as presents to Fan-chen. About this time, the emperor of the Wu dynasty sent an officer of the second rank, Kang-tai, as ambassador to Fu-nan. He met Chen-song and others and questioned them on the Indian customs. They replied : "This is a country where the law of Buddha prospers. The people are straight-forward and honest and the land is very fertile. The title of the king is Meou-loun. The capital where the king resides has a double wall of ramparts. The rivers and the sources of water are divided into a large number of zig-zag canals which carry waters into the dug-out of the outer-walls, and the water then passes into a large river. The palace and the temples are decorated with ornaments, sculptures, and engravings; in the roads, the markets, the villages, the towns, there are clocks and drums etc......."

Meou-loun has been identified by Levi with Muruṇḍa. The above account is important as showing that in the middle of the third century A.D., the Muruṇḍas had still been ruling prosperously. Cunningham, in his *Mahābodhi*, proposes to identify the capital, the description of which has been given above, with Pāṭaliputra. But the distance of 7000 li covered by the travellers up the river shows that the capital was situated further up to the west of that city.

In the accounts furnished by the *Purāṇas*, we find that one Visvasphāṇi or Viśvasphūrjhi is stated to have ruled over Magadha just before the rise of the Guptas.[21] The form of the

[21] *IA,* 1918, p. 298; *Pargiter, DKA,* p. 52 (f n 28 & 29), p 73, f n. 12.

name, it has been pointed out, shows that he was a foreigner and may have thus belonged to the Muruṇda stock. He is said to have established kings, i.e., viceroys in different places and suppressed the old ruling families and brought into existence a new Kṣatriya order. Some of the manuscripts of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* state that he brought the Kaivartas into prominence[22] and later on committed suicide by throwing himself into the Ganges.

The description clearly shows that the empire of Viśvasphāṇi was quite an extensive one[23] and may have extended in the west as far as Kānyakubja or Kanauj, for we learn from the Jaina version of the *Siṃhāsanadvātriṃśikā* that the city was under the sway of a Muruṇda rāja,[24] who may have been a viceroy of the Muruṇda king of Magadha. Viśvasphāṇi may have set up similar viceroys in other parts of his empire.

IV

THE NĀGAS

While thus the Gangetic valley had been under the sway of the Muruṇdas, a considerable portion of the Jumna valley passed under the rule of the Nāga kings The *Purāṇas* state that Vidiśā, Kāntipurī, Mathura and Padmāvatī were the strongholds of the Nāga power, and it is stated further that seven Nāga kings had ruled at Mathura and nine at Padmāvatī when the Guptas were rising to power. Padmāvatī, identified with the small village of Padam-Pawaya in Gwalior state, was possibly the home of the Bhāraśivas whose king Bhavanāga, according to the Vākātaka epigraphs, was evidently a very important monarch, and the dynasty is described as performing ten Aśvamedha sacrifices and as being "besprinkled on the forehead with the pure water of

[22] Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 52, f n. 48

[23] According to the *Bhāgavata Purāna* he had a capital at Padmāvatī, Pargiter, *DKA*, p. 52, f.n. 49; p 53, f n. 2 At this period Padmāvatī (modern Narwar dist.) seems to have been under the Nāgas

[24] A Muruṇḍa king, according to a legend, was the master of the thirty-six hundred thousand people of Kānyakūbja, see *Vikrama's Adventures*, *HOS*, vol 26, p 251; vol 27, p 223, also, *Intro*, vol 26, p xxvi.

(the river) Bhāgīrathi that had been obtained by their valour".[25] It thus appears that at least for some times under the Bhāraśivas the region extending from Gwalior to the Ganges was united under one rule. Coins disclose the existence of ten Nāga rulers: Skandanāga, Bṛhaspatināga, Vyāghranāga, Bhīmanāga, Bibhunāga, Vasunāga, Prabhākaranāga Devanāga, Bhavanāga and Gaṇapatināga. Gaṇapatināga is mentioned in the Allahabad inscription of Samudra Gupta which also speaks of another Nāga king Nāgasena. In the *Harṣacarita* Nāgasena is clearly associated with the Padmāvatī region.[26]

Some scholars think that the Purānic statement referring to the seven Nāga kings of Mathura and nine of Padmāvatī refers to two distinct Nāga kingdoms. It, however, appears that after the rise of the Bhāraśivas who had their original home in Padmāvatī, the latter along with Mathura formed really one kingdom.[27] If this view be accepted then it can be inferred that Mathura came under the Nāgas during the rule of the third king of the Bhāraśiva-Nāga dynasty.[28] Bhavanāga whose daughter was married to the Vākātaka crown prince Gautamīputra, may have ruled in the first half of the fourth century A.D. He may have been succeeded by Nāgasena and the latter by Gaṇapatināga, as we shall see later on, when we shall discuss the conquests of mahārājādhirāja Samudra Gupta who put an end to the rule of the Nāgas in the Jumna valley. (vide, Chap. vii., infra).

Besides the Nāga house of Mathura and Padmāvatī, there appears to have been other smaller Nāga principalities in

[25] *Corpus*, iii. p 241; *AHD*, p. 72.

[26] "In Padmāvatī, Nāgasena, born in the Nāga family, whose confidential deliberations were divulged by a Śārikā bird, met his doom". *cf. HC.* Trans, p. 192.

[27] This is proved by the statement of the Chammak Copper plate inscription of Pravarasena II—Regnal year 18.

[28] This follows from the Purāṇic statement indirectly, if it is supposed that Padmāvatī and Mathura were under one and the same house. Thus the first of the seven Mathura kings would naturally be the third king of Padmāvatī. Was this third king Candrāmśa, who is described as the second Nakhavant, and who evidently made some conquests including Mathura? Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri identifies him with king Candra of the Meharauli records.

different parts of North India immediately before the rise of the Guptas. Thus a copper seal inscription of the fourth century A.D. speaks of a king named Maheśvaranāga, the son of Nāgabhaṭṭa.[29] Some coins found at Ahicchatra (Rohilkhand), having close resemblance to that of the Nāgas, refer to a king named Acyuta, who thus may have been a Nāga king, and was ultimately conquered by Samudra Gupta. The Allahabad inscription further refers to kings like Nāgadatta, Nandi, and others who were also rulers of the Nāga stock Dr. Raychaudhuri points out that "in the *Purāṇas* Śiśu Nandi and Nandiyaśas are connected with the Nāga family of Central India. We know also the name of a Nāga prince named Śivanandi".[30]

V

SOME REPUBLICAN STATES

While thus the dismemberment of the Kusāṇa empire in the Jumna-Gangetic valley was chiefly caused by several monarchical houses, the republican states of Rajputana and the Eastern Punjab also took a leading part against the rule of the aliens. We have already seen that in the Junagadh inscription the Yaudheyas are described as a "very proud and indomitable" power, and after c 175 A.D we have several coins having the legend *'Yaudheyagaṇasya jayaḥ'*, 'victory of the Yaudheya tribe'.[31] The evidence clearly shows that the Yaudheyas issued the coins to commemorate their victory evidently against the Kusāṇas, who, as already stated, had kept them under the yoke of servitude. There are again certain Yaudheya coins bearing the legend *'of Brahmaṇya (a name of Kārttikeya), the divine lord of the Yaudheyas'*, or *'Of Kumāra, the divine lord Brahmaṇyadeva'*.[32] Evidently the Yaudheyas, before they went into war against the Kusānas, dedicated their state to the war-lord

[29] *Corpus*, iii. p 283
[30] *PHAI*, p. 536
[31] Allan, *Catalogue*, p 276
[32] *ib* p. 270f, p cxlix-cl, Banerjea, *DHI*, p. 142

Kārttikeya and fought in his name. A very large seal recovered from Sonait in Ludhiana bears the legend *'Yodheyānām jaya-mamtradharānām'*. Allan translates the legend as 'of the Yaudheya councillors of victory'.[33] Dr. Altekar however, thinks that "they possessed a mystic formula (*mantra*) ensuring victory in all circumstances and against all odds".[34] A fragmentary inscription from Bijayagadh in the Bharatpur district contains the reference to a mahārāja-mahāsenāpati appointed leader of the Yaudheyagaṇa.[35] As the epigraph is in the characters of the second-third century A.D. it may be inferred that in the Yaudheya republic of the time with which we are dealing here, the president was styled as mahārāja and performed the functions of the commander-in-chief.

From the distribution of their coins it may be inferred that the Yaudheyas occupied the Eastern Punjab and the northern part of Rajasthan. Their coins referring to their *jaya* or victory shows strong Kusāṇa influence in style and type and have on some of them the words *dvi* and *tr* at the end of the legend. These have been "interpreted as contractions of *Dvitīya* and *Trtīya*, second and third sections of the tribe". If this theory be accepted then we may possibly infer that like the Licchavis of the pre-Maurya days the Yaudheya republic was a confederation of several tribes under the authority of a supreme council of administrators Dr Altekar thinks that as according to the traditional belief the Arjunāyanas and Yaudheyas were the descendants of the Pāṇḍava brothers, Dharma and Arjuna, "it is likely that this belief may have facilitated the formation of a kind of loose union between the two neighbouring republics", and the words *dvi* and *tṛ*, referred to above, point to such a state of affairs.[36] As, however, we have independent coinage of the Yaudheyas and the Arjunāyanas it becomes difficult for us to agree with the above interpretation

Like the Yaudheyas, the Arjunāyanas were no doubt an im-

[33] Allan, *Catalogue*, p clii
[34] *VGA*, p 28
[35] Allan, *Catalogue*, p clii; *Corpus*, iii p 252
[36] *VGA*, p 29

portant republican tribe and they occupied, as Allan thinks, the lands lying within the triangle Delhi-Jaipur-Agra.[37] There are coins of the Arjunāyanas bearing the legend *Arjunāyānāṃ jaya (ḥ)*. But as their epigraphy suggests a date about 100 B.C. we have no reason to think that they were issued after their victory over the Kuṣāṇas. The Arjunāyanas are mentioned in the Allahabad record as a tributary state under Samudra Gupta.

Another important republican tribe, the Mālavas, occupied about this time a considerable portion of the Rajasthan region with their capital at Mālava-nagara, which has been identified with Nagar or Karkota-nagar in Uniyara in the Jaipur district. The Mālavas were thus the immediate neighbours of the Arjunāyanas. Their coins have been divided into two groups.[38] the first, bears the legends *Malavānām jaya* or *Malavahṇa jaya* and they possibly belong to the period immediately after the fall of the Kusāṇas. Thus it is clear from the legends that, like the Yaudheyas, they also took some part in putting an end to the rule of the Kuṣāṇas in the interior of India. The second class of coins, which on the ground of the characters of the legends on them should be assigned to the "second and third centuries A.D.", are really puzzling. They bear inscriptions like Bhapamyana, Majupa, Mapojaya, Mapaya, Magajaśa, Magojaya, Mapaka, Pacha, Gajava, Maraja, Jamaku etc. The exact meaning of these legends is obscure. Allan thinks that they are not names but in most cases meaningless attempts to reproduce parts of *Mālavānāṃ jaya*.[39] This, according to him, accounts for so many of them beginning with *ma* and for the frequency of *ja* as another letter of the inscription We are sorry that we cannot agree with this theory, and, on the contrary, are inclined to think that they are really names of chiefs We may, for example, consider the two names in the above list, *Magajaśa and Magojaya*. According to the Mahābhārata, the term Maga denoted the priestly class of the Śakas, or in other words, the term denoted a branch of the Śaka people.[40] Thus the terms may be divided

[37] Allan, *Catalogue*, p lxxxiii.
[38] *ib.* p. cv.
[39] *ib* p. cvii.
[40] *Mbh* vi. 2; *Kūrma Purāṇa*, xlviii, 36.

into two parts, e.g., *Maga-jaśa, Mago-jaya,* and they can easily be considered to be the names of particular persons belonging to the Scythian stock. One fact, however, goes against such an *interpretation, the names are not given in the genitive.*

The Nandsa Yupa Pillar inscription dated in the Mālava year 282 = 226 A.D. gives us the following account of some chiefs belonging to the Mālava-vaṃśa, existing in the Mālava-gaṇa-visaya : "Śrī (?) Soma, the leader of the Sogis, son of Jayasoma, grandson of Prabhāgra (?) vardhaṇa, dancer at victory, born in Mālava stock, as famous as the Ikṣvākus".[41]

The chiefs mentioned in the above record are described as rājarṣis. It is further stated that freedom and prosperity had returned to the country on account of the achievements of Soma. It is not unlikely that he fought against the western kṣatrapas and ultimately became successful to make his country free of any danger from that quarter. The Mālavas continued to rule till the time of Samudra Gupta, who, as the Allahabad record informs us, reduced them to vassalage.

An inscription discovered at Badva in Kotah state discloses the existence of one mahāsenāpati Bala and his three sons belonging to the Maukhari stock.[42] The inscription is dated 239 A.D. and records the performance of Trirātra sacrifice by the sons of the mahāsenāpati. The Maukharis, as we have already seen, were a very ancient clan known from a clay seal inscription written in Maurya characters discovered in the Gaya region. It is difficult to determine how the Maukhari Bala was related to the Maukharis of Magadha or with the later Maukharis who usurped the imperial position after the fall of the Guptas in c 550 A D. The title of mahāsenāpati shows that Bala was not an independent potentate and may have owed allegiance to the Mālava republic, or to the Śakas of Ujjayinī.

[41] *Ep Ind* xxvii pp. 252ff.
[42] *ib.* xxiii. p. 52.

VI

THE LATER SAKA SATRAPS

We have given above an account of the kingdoms and republics that came into existence on the ashes of the Kuṣāṇa empire. Let us now turn to the history of the regions lying originally outside the jurisdiction of the Kusāṇas during the period under review.

To begin with the history of the dynasty of Casṭana that flourished in Western India. As we have already stated there is hardly anything interesting in the history of this dynasty after the fall of Rudradāman.[43] Numismatic evidences show that Rudradāman was succeeded by his son Dāmaghsada.[44] His ksatrapa coins prove that he had been associated with his father in the work of administration, while the mahāksatrapa coins bearing the portrait of his old age show evidently that he came to the throne at an advanced age, and hence he may have ruled for a short period only.

Coins show that after the death of Dāmaghsada, his brother Rudrasimha I and his son Jīvadāman ruled alternately till 199 A D. while the office of mahāksatrapa remained in abeyance for two occasions, from 179 A.D to 181 A.D. and again for two years from 188 A D. to 190 A.D. Rapson thinks that this was due to a struggle for succession between Rudrasimha I and Jīvadāman [45]

Available evidences seem to indicate however, that on these two occasions the supreme power in the ksatrapa dominion passed from the hands of the members of the dynasty of Castana to some non-Scythian potentates. Thus the Gunda inscription of 181 A.D. shows the Ābhīra general Rudrabhūti referring to Rudrasimha as ksatrapa, ignoring the existence of any mahāksa-

[43] *supra*, p. 137

[44] Rapson, *Catalogue*, p 80-2. On his own coins we find the name as Dāmaghsada, but on the records of his descendants the name appears as Dāmajada

[45] Bhandarkar's view that Jīvadāman was not a mahāksatrapa before 181 A.D can hardly be maintained in view of the numismatic evidences, *JNSI*, i pp 18-20.

trapa altogether.[46] It is not unlikely that Rudrabhūti was an overpowerful general who usurped the mahākṣatrapa power and Jīvadāman who held the office of mahākṣatrapa in A.D. 178-9, after the death of his father Dāmaghsada, went into exile, while Rudrasimha I agreed to serve in a subordinate role under his *de facto* new master. Like Senāpati Pusyamitra, Rudrabhūti possibly did not adopt any higher title. Ere long, however, Rudrasiṃha I became a stronger one to assume an independent status and ruled as mahāksatrapa for nearly seven years from 181 to 188 A.D. But he was again degraded and ruled as ksatrapa only for the years 188 to 190 A.D., and again during this period there was no mahāksatrapa in the Śaka dominion Bhandarkar, Altekar and some other scholars think that an Ābhīra named Iśvaradatta was the mahāksatrapa during these two years. Rapson, however, has no doubt that Iśvaradatta reigned between 236 and 239 A.D. It is quite probable that between 188 and 190 A.D, the Sātavāhanas held sway over the Śaka dominion of Western India If we turn to a study of the coins of the Sātavāhana king Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi, we find that they are found in Gujrat, Kathiawad, Aparānta, the Chanda district in the Madhya Pradesh and the Krishna district of the Madras state. Thus there can be no doubt that he ruled over both the Andhra and the Mahārāṣṭra countries and snatched away a part of the dominion over which ruled the descendants of Castana. Smith points out in his *Catalogue* that the silver coins of Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi imitate the coinage of the Śaka rulers of Ujjayinī—a fact which possibly proves his victory over the latter. After this victory, the mahāksatrapa of the Śaka realm was evidently reduced to a subordinate position and Rudrasimha I became a subordinate ksatrapa under the Sātavāhana emperor. It was after the death of the Sātavāhana emperor that the Śakas recovered their independence and the office of the mahāksatrapa revived again. This gives us a fixed point in the Sātavāhana chronology: the year 190 A.D. = the last year of Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇi's reign.[47]

[46] *Ep Ind* xvi p 233.

[47] On the assumption that 190 A D. is equivalent to the last year of

About 200 A.D. Rudrasena I, the son of Rudrasiṃha, I, became the mahākṣatrapa. To his reign belong the Mulwasar tank inscription of 200 A.D., and the Jasdhan Pillar inscription of 205 A.D[48] In the Jasdhan inscription the title of *Bhadramukha* is applied to all ancestors of Rudrasena except Jayadāman, the father of Rudradāman, and the names of the ancestors who are not in direct descent have not been included.

Spooner discovered at Basarh a clay-seal with the inscription: "(the seal) of the great queen Prabhudamā, sister of the king the mahākṣatrapa Svāmī Rudrasena, and the daughter of the king the mahākṣatrapa Svāmī Rudrasimha".[49] The seal does not appear to have been carried at Basarh from outside and so the great queen Prabhudamā must have lived at the region where it was found. The region at this period evidently formed a part of the Muruṇḍa dominion and Prabhudamā probably was a Murunda queen. She was evidently given in marriage to a Muruṇḍa chief, and by this matrimonial alliance the Śakas of the Western India probably hoped to strengthen their hands.

From the evidence of the coins we learn that Rudrasena I (200-22 A D.) was succeeded in the office of mahākṣatrapa by his brothers Saṃghadāman (222-3 A.D) and Dāmasena (223-36 A D)

Yajñaśrī Śātakarni's reign, we may draw up the Sātavāhana chronology thus:

Gautamīputra Śātakarṇi	c 99 A D—123 A D
Vāśiṣṭhīputra Pulumāyi	c 123 A D—147 A D
Śiva Śrī Śātakarni	c 147 A.D—154 A.D
Śiva-Skanda Śātakarni or Śivamaka-Śāda	c 154 A D—161 A D
Yajñaśrī Śātakarni	c 161 A D—190 A D

In determining the reign periods of these kings, we have mainly relied upon the evidences of the *inscriptions* and the *Matsya Purāna* which is considered by Rapson and others to be the most authoritative for the history of the Sātavāhana kings

The above scheme shows that the Śātakarni mentioned in the Junagadh record can be identified with Śiva Śrī Śātakarni, vide, *supra*, pp 127, 134

[48] *Ep. Ind* xvi. p. 238; Rapson, *Catalogue*, lxii no 41.

[49] *ASR*, 1913-4, p. 136.

respectively. The next mahākṣatrapa, Dāmasena s second son Yaśodāman, came to power in 238 A.D., and thus for two years there was a gap in the line of the Śaka mahākṣatrapas. Rapson thinks that the Ābhīra Īśvaradatta ruled over the Śaka realm during this interval.

The earliest mention of the Ābhīras in India seems to occur in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali where they are associated with the Śūdras.[50] They were a foreign tribe and possibly entered into India during the confusions after Alexander's death,[51] and probably settled at the spot where the river Sarasvatī disappears in the sand—the present Hissar in the Punjab.[52] The country of Ābhīras has been mentioned as Abiria in the *Periplus* and as Aberia in the *Geographike* of Ptolemy, according to which it formed a part of the Indo-Scythia or the Lower Indus valley.

Coins of Mahākṣatrapa Īśvraradatta, the Ābhīra, have been found in Kathiawad, dated in the first and the second years of his own reign, and Bhagawanlal Indraji thought that he was pro-abably connected with the Ābhīra dynasty of Īśvarasena of the Nasik inscription, and founded the Traikuṭaka era of 248-49 A D. Rapson, however, is definitely of opinion that Īśvaradatta reigned between 236 and 239 A.D. He may have been an Ābhīra originally in the service of the Śaka kṣatrapas (cf. Gunda inscription) and later on appropriated the supreme position for himself. He evidently failed to establish a dynasty of his own, and in 238 A.D. Dāmasena's second son Yaśodāman again became mahākṣatrapa. He was succeeded by his brothers Vijayasena (239-50 A.D.) and Dāmajadasrī III (251-55 A.D.). Dāmajadaśrī was succeeded by his nephew Rudrasena II (256 ?)—76 A D), who was succeeded by his two sons Viśvasimha and Bhartrdāman.

We next enter into an obscure period of the Śaka history, and as Rapson has pointed out, there was no mahākṣatrapa in the Śaka realm from A.D. 295 to c. 340 A.D. The evidences of coins show that the line of Castana in direct descent came to an end after 305 A.D. and there arose a new line of kṣatrapas and

[50] *Mahābhāṣya*, I 2. 3
[51] Tarn, *GBI*, p 712
[52] *Mbh.* ix 37. 1.

mahākṣatrapas. As we shall see later on precisely during this period the Sassanids of Iran extended their sway into India and the Later Kuṣāṇas, the Śakas of Ujjayinī and the Ābhīras were compelled to acknowledge their supremacy as overlords. From 295 A.D. to c.340 A.D. the coins of the following ksatrapas are available :

Viśvasena, son of mahāksatrapa Bhartrdāman	(A.D. 293-304)
Rudrasimha I	(A.D. 304)
Yaśodāman II	(A.D. 317-32)

After 332 A.D., the last date so far known on the coins of Yaśodāman II, the next earliest date on the coins of this series is Śaka 270 = 348 A.D., which is found on the coins of king mahāksatrapa svāmī Rudrasena, son of king mahāksatrapa svāmī Rudradāman II. We have thus an interval of 16 years in which there are no coins of any of the Śaka ksatrapas There are no coins or inscriptions, on the other hand. of the mahākṣatrapa svāmī Rudradāman II, and as it has been assumed, he evidently ruled sometimes in this interval of 16 years. The absence of any remnant of his reign shows that he must have passed through troublesome times. The relationship of Rudradāman II with the dynasty of Casṭana is not known, but as his name ends in *-dāman* which is the characteristic of the family of Casṭana, he probably belonged to a collateral branch of the same family.

The coins of Rudrasena III, son of Rudradāman II, may be divided into two groups— (1) the dates of which range from 348 A.D. to 351 A.D., and (2) the dates of which fall between 364 A.D. and 378 A.D The thirteen years which fall between 351 A.D. and 364 A.D. were probably marked by some political disturbances during which the coinage ceased. There are some lead coins, however, the dates of which range from 358 A.D. to 372 A.D. and they belong, therefore, though not entirely, to the period during which no silver coins are found.[53]

In any case, it is difficult to determine the order of succession after Rudrasena III. Coins afford us the following four names of the mahāksatrapas,—Siṃhasena, (coins dated 304 of

[53] Rapson, *Catalogue*, pp cxliv-cxlvi; pp 179-88

30x), Rudrasena IV, Satyasiṃha, Rudrasimha III (coins dated 310 or 31x)

Thus we find that within a brief span of seven years, at least three, if not four, mahākṣatrapas ruled, a fact which probably indicates an unsettled state of affairs. The date 310 = 388 A.D. is the last known one of the western kṣatrapas whose coins extended over a period of some 270 years. This date, in any case, cannot be very far from the Gupta conquests of the western ksatrapas. It is, however, not certain whether the victim of the Guptas was Rudrasimha III himself, or any of his successor. But the contemporaneity of Candra Gupta II and the absence of any further ksatrapa coins and inscriptions strongly indicates that he was possibly the Śaka prince of the west uprooted by the Gupta monarch.[54]

An inscription discovered by Sir John Marshall at Kanakhera, near Sanchi, discloses the existence of an independent Śaka principality ruled by the mahādaṇḍanāyaka Śrīdharavarman, son of Nanda.[55] The inscription seems to be dated in his own thirteenth regnal year, and not in the Śaka year 241 = 319 A.D. as N. G. Majumdar thinks. The view of R. D. Banerjee that the regnal year refers to Jīvadāman's rule can hardly be accepted, because the latter never ruled as the mahākṣatrapa. We have already seen that there was no mahākṣatrapa in the Śaka dominion from 295 A.D. to 340 A.D. Probably taking advantage of the prevailing adverse situation, Śrīdharavarman, originally an official of the Śaka house of Malwa, declared his independence. Like so many other cases, Śrīdharavarman used original official or subordinate title even after he has assumed independence.

[54] *infra*

[55] *Ep Ind* xvi p 232; *JPASB*, xix p. 343; *IHQ*, xxii (1946), p 39-40.

VII

THE DYNASTY OF CANDRAVARMAN

Though Kuṣāṇa coins, as already noted, have been found in different parts of Bengal, there is absolutely no evidence to show that the province was ever included within the empire of the Devaputras. On the eve of the rise of the Guptas, we have at our disposal only one epigraphic record engraved on the Susunia hill in the Bankura district of West Bengal, about 12 miles north-west of the town of Bankura.[56] The record consisting of only three lines mentions a mahārāja Candravarman. He was the son of mahārāja Simhavarman or Siddhavarman, and the title of *Puskaraṇādhipati* is given to him. This shows that the dynasty consisting of at least two kings had its headquarters in Puṣkaraṇa identified with Pokharna, the name of the place where the record has been found. He appears to have been a local king of the place and there is no evidence to think that he was "a mighty warrior who extended his dominions eastwards as far as the Faridpur district."[57] This Candravarman has been identified by some scholars with the king of the same name mentioned in the Allahabad record, by others with king Candra of the Meharauli Iron Pillar inscription, and by some others again it has been held that he was originally a king of Western India and that Puskaraṇa should be identified with "Pokharan in the Jodhpur state in Rajputana".

It is difficult to agree with any of the above theories. Candravarman mentioned in the Allahabad record, as we shall see later on, was a king of the Ganges-Jumna valley most probably, while the region of Western Bengal, or at least a greater portion of it appears to have been conquered by Candra Gupta I, the father of Samudra Gupta. If Candra Gupta I's dominion really extended in the east upto the river Ganges (*infra*) then there is every reason to believe that the dominion of

[56] *Ep. Ind.* xii. p 317f; xiii. p 133; *ASR*, 1927-8, p 188f.
[57] *HB*, p 45.

Candravarman was conquered by the first Gupta mahārājādhirāja.

Mm. H. P. Śastri identifies Candravarman with king Candra of the Meharauli record and thinks that he belonged to the Varman family of Daśapura. The Mandasor inscription of the Mālava year 461 = 403 A.D. gives the names of three successive kings, Jayavarman, his son Simhavarman, and Naravarman.[58] It is believed that the father of Candravarman, whose name is tentatively read by some as Siṃhavarman, is identical with Siṃhavarman, the son of Jayavarman of the Mandasor record. Further, Candravarman, who is held to be identical with king Candra, came to Bengal and defeated a confederacy of enemies there and then set up the record on the Susunia hill. As Dr. B C. Sen says : "It is difficult to agree with this view, as none of the inscriptions connected with the Western Mālava family give Candravarman's name, nor do they refer to Pushkarana, the seat of Candravarman's government. No serious conclusion should be drawn from the fact that the Mandasor inscription and possibly also the Susunia inscription mention the same name Siṃhavarman".[59] Again, Candravarman's identification with Candra of the Meharauli inscription can hardly be accepted. As we shall see later on, king Candra is probably identical with the Gupta emperor Candra Gupta II

The *Purāṇas* state that the Devarakṣitas ruled over Pauṇdra (North Bengal ?), Kośala, Odra and Tāmralipta, while the Guptas had under them Prayāga, Sāketa, Magadha and the territories along the Ganges. Who these Devaraksitas were we do not know. If they ruled over Kośala then it must be inferred that they had dislodged the rule of Muruṇdas in that place. The Purānic account, however, is a hopelessly corrupt one and it is not likely that Kośala here refers to Daksina-Kośala. Again, the *Visṇu Purāṇa* states Andhra in place of Odra, while R. C. Majumdar has concluded that the Devakaraksitas thus were connected with Devarāṣṭra in the Vizagapatam district.[60]

[58] *Ep. Ind* xii. pp 320f
[59] *Sen, SHAIB,* p 202.
[60] *BDU,* no 3, p 30.

The political condition of Bengal on the eve of the rise of the Guptas is best summarised by Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri, in the following words:

"It would appear that the general political condition of Bengal at the beginning of the fourth century A D. was not probably very different from that depicted in the epics. A number of sturdy states, sheltered by the great barriers of rivers and swamps, constituted its most prominent characteristic."[61]

VIII

THE LATER KUṢĀṆAS AND THE SASSANIDS

It has been already stated that while the Kusāna rule came to an end in the interior of India about 176 A D, the descendants of the great Kaniska continued their supremacy in the Punjab and the North-Western Frontier Provinces[62] The existence of one Kaniṣka (III) and Vasu or Vāsudeva (II) is disclosed to us by the evidence of coins. The coins of this Kaniṣka may broadly be divided into two groups,—(i) those found in Bactria and Afganistan have on the reverse the figure of Śiva and his bull; and (ii) those found in the Punjab, Gandhara and Seistan bear on the reverse the figure of the Roman goddess, seated Ardoksho. These numismatic evidences seem to indicate that Kaniska III's sway extended over the region from the Punjab to Bactria in the north and Seistan in the west

Kaniṣka's coins further bear on the obverse sides names like Vāsu (deva), Viru (pāksa) and Mahī (śvara or dhara) and abbreviated letters like *vi, si, bhri, pa, na, ga, cu, khu, tha, vai* etc. It is difficult to determine the exact significance either of the names or of the abbreviated letters As, however, Vāsudeva was the immediate successor of Kaniska III, it may be inferred that the term Vasu on the coins refers to the prince who was evidently his governor On similar grounds therefore we may infer that *Mahi* and *Viru* were other governors of the same king,

[61] *HB*, p 46.
[62] *supra*, pp 112; *JASB* (iv) 1908, pp. 81ff; *PMC*, pp 211-2

though nothing can be said definitely on the point. The abbreviated letters like *vi*, *si* etc., may be the signatures of the mint-masters.

Kaniska III was probably succeeded by his son Vāsudeva II who had acted as his governor possibly in the province of Seistan, Afganistan and Bactria. The coins of this prince are rare and have on the reverse the figure of Śiva with his bull, which was the prevalent type of currency in Afganistan and Bactria during his father's time. This seems to indicate that he lost his control over the Punjab and the North-Western Frontier Province, where evidently Kaniska III's governors like Virupākṣa and Mahīdhara declared their independence and set up independent principalities of their own. He is identified with Po-tiao, the king of the Kusānas who sent an embassy to the Chinese emperor to ask for help in c. 230 A.D.[63] The help was sought for as Vāsudeva II was pressed from all the directions; *first*, the provincial governors on this side of the Hindukush had declared their independence; *secondly*, the Juan-Juan tribe, later known in history as the Epthalites or the White Huns, had been pressing from the north; and *thirdly*, the Sassanids were threatening from the western side. Of these the Sassanid danger proved to be the most formidable one and brought a tremendous change not only in the fate of the Later Kuśāṇas, but also in the annals of India as well.

Ardashir, the founder of the Sassanid dynasty, defeated the Parthian king Artabanus V in A.D. 224, conquered the western provinces of the Parthian empire and declared himself king with the title of Shāhanshāh of Iran.[64] According to Tabari, Ardashir after conquering the country bordering on Khorasan, Merv, Balkh and Khiva received messengers from the kings of Kuśān, Turān and Makrān. Ferishta states that Ardashir marched against India and reached the neighbourhood of Sirhind, but Junah, the reigning monarch, gave pearls, gold, jewels and

[63] *CII*, II 1 p. lxxvii

[64] For the Sassanids, Rawlinson, "*The Seventh Oriental Monarchy or the Sassanian Empire*", McGovern, "*The Early Empires of Central Asia*", pp. 401ff; Sykes, "*History of Persia*", vol. i. pp 394ff; F.D.G. Paruck, "*Sassanian Coins*".

elephants and thus induced Ardashir to return. Smith is inclined to take the statement of Ferishta as historical but other scholars generally put little reliance on it.[65]

Ardashir followed the practice of appointing crown princes as governors in the conquered provinces. Such governors issued their own coins and we have certain such specimens having on the reverse Śiva and the bull, the type that was prevalent in Bactria and Afganistan under Vāsudeva II. If we now consider these coins in the background of the account of Tabari as given above we can possibly infer that Bactria passed under the Sassanids during the time of the Kusāṇa king Vāsudeva II, who, however, may have continued his precarious existence in the Kabul valley, possibly as a subordinate ruler under Ardashir.

This discomfiture of the Kusāṇa prince naturally offered a welcome opportunity to the former governors on this side of the Hindukush who had already declared their independence after the death of Kaniska III. The numismatic evidences seem to indicate that there arose in this part of India three Scythian houses. A large horde of coins discovered at Peshawar bears on the obverse the curious inscription Shāka. It was evidently the name of the dynasty that came into power during this troublesome period These coins resemble so closely the issues of Kaniṣka III and Vāsudeva II that we may safely assign them after the period of the last-named monarch. They also bear names like Sita, Śayatha and Sena and initials like *Pra*, *Mi*, *Bha*, and *Bhri*. The initials are evidently those of the mint-masters while the names may be of the princes of the house.[66]

Numismatic evidences show that while the Shāka dynasty was thus ruling over the region lying to the west of the Indus, in the Punjab plains two dynasties, the Shīladas and the Gadaharas, founded two independent principalities of their own It is believed that kings like Bacharna, Bhadra and Pasana belonged to the dynasty of the Shīladas while Peraya and Kirada to the

[65] Smith, *JRAS*. 1920, pp 221-6.

[66] Cunningham, *Later Indo-Scythians*. Reprinted from the *Numismatic Chronicle*, London, 1888-92

other. As the name Samudra = Samudra Gupta, the Gupta emperor = is found on a coin of a Gadahara chief, it is believed that these dynasties survived till at least the time of the Guptas.[67]

This unsettled political condition of the Punjab had indirectly another effect. Some of the Indian republican tribes tried to reassert their independence which had been curbed by the Kusāṇa overlords since their conquest of India. Thus we hear of the existence of the Madra republic in the Allahabad record. The Madras lived between the Chenub and the Ravi and had Śākala or Sialkot as their capital. Przyluski thinks that they entered India shortly before the Achaemenid period and in Indian literature they are sometimes classed among the barbarians as they had some non-Indian customs among them.[68] Similarly, another republican tribe, the Kunindas, occupying the region between the upper courses of the Sutlej and the Beas, reasserted its independence. A Kuninda coin of c.200 A D. bears the name of a ruler Chatreśvara having the titles Mahātman and Bhāgavata. On the obverse of the same there is the figure of Kārtikeya, which may be compared with the contemporary coinage of the Yaudheyas Chatreśvara may have been the leader of the Kuninda tribe and possibly fought against the alien rulers of the Punjab and thus brought about the independence of his country.[69]

The north-western part of India, including the Punjab, was thus highly disunited and this must have prompted the successors of the Sassanid monarch Ardashir to penetrate into the interior of India, as it had done some six hundred years ago in case of the Macedonian hero Alexander the Great. Excavations at Begram show that the city was sacked by Shahpur I, in the period between A D. 241 and 250 As the coins of Vāsudeva were the latest of the Kusāna remnants found at that place[70] it may be inferred that Shahpur possibly conquered the region ruled over by the Later Kusāṇas, after the death of Vāsudeva II

[67] *VGA*, pp 18-9.
[68] *JA*, 1926, p 13; 1929, pp 315-7
[69] Allan, *Catalogue*, pp 159ff
[70] *supra*, p 94

whose descendants had now to acknowledge the overlordship of the Sassanid lords.

Varhran II (276-93 A.D) was undoubtedly entangled in Indian affairs. According to Vopiscus, the Roman author of the life of emperor Carus, Varhran II was occupied by a "domestic rebellion", in the year 283 A.D. In 291 A.D. Mamertimus alludes to these events, and states that the rebellion of his brother Ormies i.e., Hormizd was supported against the king by the Śaka, Kusān and Gelon. Varhran II conquered the whole of Sakastān and made his son Varhran III, Sakanshāh or the governor of Sakastān (Seistan).[71]

It is not known for certain whether Varhran II conquered himself any part of India. The Paikuli inscriptions mention the chiefs of Paradan (Paradas), Makuran (Makran), the Ābhīras and the kṣatrapas of Avanti (Avandikan xvat (a) vya) as vassals under Varhran III. Mention is made also of the satrap Bagdat, lord of Zuradian (Bhagadatta, lord of Surāṣṭra) and Mitr-(AL) asen, lord of Boraspicin (Mitrasena, lord of Bharukaccha).[72] Curiously enough among the independent kings we find the name of Kusāṇ-shāh. The exact significance of the expression Kusāṇ-shāh is not clear. But as already the descendants of Vāsudeva had acknowledged the Sassanid supremacy, the independent Kusān-shāh of the Paikuli record can only refer to the dynasties in Gandhāra and the Punjab This also explains why there was no mahāksatrapa in the Śaka realm after 295 A.D.[73]

In 293 A.D., after the death of his father, Varhran III succeeded unwillingly, but was dethroned after a short reign of only four months by his grand-uncle Naresh, son of Shahpur I. It thus appears extremely improbable that Varhran III made any fresh conquest In that case his Indian feudatories as described in the Paikuli record must have been brought under the Sassanid yoke during the reign of his father Varhran II.

As regards the Sassanid hold on India, we may note the following facts as well ·

[71] *MASI*, no 38

[72] Herzfeld, *Paikuli*, pp. 35-51.

[73] *supra*, p 156.

(a) A Pahlavi inscription of Persepolis is written in the year ii (?) i.e, A.D. 310-11 of Shahpur II, by Shahpur Śakānshāh, an elder brother of the infant king, who has the titles "King of Sakastān, minister of ministers of Sind, Sakastān and Tukhāristān", and is accompanied by the Sakastān andarazpet, 'the minister of Public Instruction of Sakastān', by the Zrang satrap, the satrap of Seistan and other dignitaries.[74]

(b) Another Pahlavi inscription of Persepolis "is written by Slok i.e., Seleucus high-judge of Kabul, in the year 47 (?) of Shahpur II—the numbers are much obliterated—who according to this record is paying homage to Shahpur Śakānshāh as a superior, showing that even Kabul belonged to the lands governed by the Śakānshāh at that time, and that the elder brother of the king ruled the country for an astonishingly long period".[75]

(c) In c 358-60 A D. one Grumbates, who is considered to be a Kuṣāṇa prince, helped Shahpur II against the Romans in the siege of Amida. This prince is described as the king of the Chionitae, "of middle age and wrinkled limbs, but of a grand spirit and already distinguished for many victories".[76]

(5) Jarl Charpentier points out that at the time of Cosmas Indicopleustes (c.500 A D.) the right side of the Indus delta belonged to Persia.[77]

From the above discussions it is clear that although the hold of the Sassanids extended into the interior of India for some time after 295 A.D., their main supremacy remained confined to the region lying to the west of the Indus, where the descendants of Vāsudeva II and the members of the Shāka dynasty had to acknowledge their supremacy. There is absolutely no reason to think that the Gadaharas or the Shīladas of the Punjab ever became subordinate under their rule.

[74] *MASI*, no. 38, pp. 36f

[75] *ib.*, pp. 36f.

[76] *NC*, (xiii), 1893, pp 171-2

[77] *Aiyangar Com Vol*, p 16

CHAPTER VII

THE GUPTAS

The foundation of the Gupta dynasty in the beginning of the fourth century A.D. marks a new epoch in the history of North India. The veil of oblivion wrapping up the age immediately succeeding the Kusāṇas is now lifted, and with the help of the archaeological and literary sources we can now follow the fortunes of a single Imperial dynasty whose chronology can be determined with a tolerable degree of certainty. Ancient India saw her golden age under the banner of the Guptas and the root of the Hindu civilisation took its strong hold in this period.

The history of the Guptas, extending over nearly two and half centuries, may be divided into the following headings:

I. Original home of the Guptas.
II. The foundation of the Gupta empire.
III. The expansion of the Gupta empire.
IV. The Imperial crisis and the foreign invasion.
V. The disintegration of the Gupta empire.
VI. The fall of the Gupta empire.

I

ORIGINAL HOME OF THE GUPTAS

In an article in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, xiv. 532-35, Dr. D. C. Ganguly first drew our attention to the view that "the early home of the Imperial Guptas is to be located in Murshidabad, Bengal, and *not in Magadha*".

The view is based on a statement of I-tsing who states that 500 years before his time a Chinese traveller named Hui-lun came to Nalanda and then he found that "Mahārāja Śrī-Gupta built a temple for the Chinese priests and granted twenty-four villages as an endowment for its maintenance. This temple, known as the 'Temple of China', was situated close to a sanc-

tuary called Mi-li-kia-si-kia-po-no which was about forty yojanas to the east of Nalanda, following the course of the Ganges".

Following Allan, Dr. Ganguly identifies mahārāja Śrī-Gupta with mahārāja Gupta who founded the Gupta dynasty. Further, on the ground that forty yojanas are equivalent to 240 English miles, he locates the sanctuary mentioned in the Chinese records in Bengal.

Fleet and other scholars have maintained that there is some chronological difficulty in identifying mahārāja Śrī-Gupta with mahārāja Gupta for the latter flourished at the end of the third century A.D., while I-tsing places mahārāja Śrī-Gupta at the end of the second century A.D. Allan, however, finds no difficulty on the point, in view of "the lapse of time and the fact that the Chinese pilgrim gives the statement on the authority of a tradition handed down from ancient times by old men".[1] There is indeed some force in Allan's argument. The Chinese traveller Yuan-Chwang places the Epthalite ruler Mihirakula "several centuries ago" before his time, but on that account any one would hardly reject his description of the king on the ground that Mihirakula ruled only a century before his date.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out that in an illustrated *Cambridge Mss.*, dated 1015 A.D., from Nepal, there is a picture of a stūpa with the label: *"Mṛgasthāpana Stūpa of Varendri"*.[2] Foucher has shown that the Indian original of the term Mi-li-kia-si-kia-po-no should be Mṛgasthāpana and not Mṛgaśikhāvana as restored by Chavannes.[3]

It is thus clear that a portion of Varendri was included within the dominion of the first Gupta monarch mahārāja Gupta. The identification as proposed by Dr. Ganguly has got two defects:

[1] Allan, *CGD*, p. xv.

[2] *HB*, p. 69.

[3] Foucher, *Icon*, pp 62-3 Chavannes published a literal translation of I-tsing's account in his: *"Voyages des Pelerins Bouddhistes"*. A wrong and faulty summary of the account was published by Beal in *IA*, 1881, pp 109ff, and later on somewhat corrected by him in *JRAS*, 1881, pp 570f, and a résumé of the same in his *Introduction* to his translation of the *Life of Hiuen tsang*.

(a) Murshidabad is not in Varendri but in the Rādha division Sandhyākara Nandī locates Varendri between the Ganges and the Karatoyā, and even today "the extensive tract of country on the confines of the districts of Dinajpur, Maldah, Rajsahi, Bogra and Rangpur . is known by the name of Varind".[4]

(b) 240 miles direct east of Nalanda is no doubt Murshidabad, but from the nature of I-tsing's description it is quite clear that the traveller first went to the Ganges from Nalanda and then voyaged down the river. So, 240 miles should be calculated to include the distance from Nalanda to the Ganges, and then by the course of the Ganges towards the east. I have measured the distance on the Survey of India Maps and have found that the distance, thus calculated, brings us to Maldah.

The *Vāyu* Purāṇa gives the following account:

"Anu-Gaṅgā (Gaṅgam) — Prayāgañca Sāketaṃ Magadhāmstathā,
Etān janapadān sarvān bhoksyante Guptavamśajāh" [5]

Pargiter gives the following translation of the above verse: "Kings born of the Gupta race will enjoy all these territories, namely, along the Ganges, Prayāga, Sāketa, and the Magadhas".

In the above account we have to note the following; *first*, here we get the variant readings *Anu-Gaṅgam* & *Anu-Gaṅgā*, and, *secondly*, it adds the new name of *Sāketa*.

Dr. H. C. Raychaudhuri thinks that Prayāga and Kośala (Sāketa) were possibly conquered by Candra Gupta I, the third king and the first mahārājādhirāja of the Gupta dynasty.[6] If we agree with this view we may possibly infer that originally i e., before Candra Gupta I, the Guptas were rulers of Magadha and the territory along the Ganges, if we accept the reading *Anu-Gaṅgā* in the above accounts.

[4] *SHAIB*, p 112.
[5] Pargiter, *DKA*.
[6] *PHAI*, pp. 531-32

But the question now arises—which reading shall we accept: "*Anu-Gangā*" or "*Anu-Gangam*" as qualifying the term "*Prayāgam*". In the second reading the particle "*ca*" becomes unnecessary, while it carries meaning if we prefer the first reading i.e., *Anu-Gangā*. Further, we should note that both the terms *tathā* and *ca* carry the same sense. This shows that the reading *Anu-Gangā* is the correct one, and it further tallies with the Chinese account discussed above.

Thus we may conclude that the original Gupta territory comprised Magadha and "the regions along the river Ganges" extending upto Northern West-Bengal. The evidences at our disposal hardly prove absolutely that "Magadha was not the original home of the Guptas" It may of course be argued that Magadha may have been conquered at a later date by mahārāja Ghatotkaca, the son of mahārāja Gupta. But of this there is absolutely no evidence.

Sanskrit scholars may take objection against acceptance of the reading of *Anu-Gaṅgā* in the *Purāṇic* texts describing the empire of the Guptas The reading has been preferred on the ground that it agrees with the available Chinese evidences. As regards the grammatical subtleties involved in the expressions (*Anu-Gaṅgā* and *Anu-Gaṅgam*) we may note the following:

The term *Anu-Gaṅgam* is no doubt justified according to the rules of *Avyayībhāva* compound but at the same time we may accept the expression *Anu-Gaṅgā* by the rules of the *Prādi* compound: "*Anugatā Gaṅgā yasyām* (*bhūmau*) *sā*". In this sense we should take the term *bhūmi* as an understood one. It may, however, be argued that in such a case the expression should have been in the accusative form. The *Purāṇic* texts on the Guptas, it should be noted, are hopelessly corrupt and we can only accept a reading in such texts that tallies with other known evidences. Further, such loose uses of grammar are often found in the literary works and epigraphs dealing with historical facts Dr D C Sircar has pointed out a large number of such cases in the epigraphic records. (*PIHC*, 1954, pp. 72ff) I consulted Pandit Sukhamay Śāstrī *Saptatīrtha* of the Visvabharati University on this point and he also opines that there is no harm in accepting the reading *Anu-Gaṅgā*. Further, the particles

ca and *tathā* as already stated, seem to suggest the same reading.

II

THE FOUNDATION OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

The Gupta records give the following conventional account of the early kings of the dynasty:

Mahārāja Gupta
|
Ghatotkaca
|
Mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta I = Kumāra Devī, the Licchavi
|
Samudra Gupta
|

It will be noted that while Candra Gupta I and Samudra Gupta have been given the higher title of mahārājādhirāja, the first two kings of the dynasty, Gupta and Ghaṭotkaca, have been deliberately given the inferior title of mahārāja. The title mahārāja was assumed by many independent kings in this period, like the Licchavis of Nepal, the Maghas, the Bhāraśivas and the Vākāṭakas, but the Gupta tradition was a quite different one. In all the official Gupta epigraphs, independent kings are described as mahārājādhirāja while the title of mahārāja is assumed by only subordinate rulers.[7] Judged in the background

[7] In the Mankuwar Stone Image inscription of the year 129 (A D 449), the emperor Kumāra Gupta I is styled simply mahārāja śrī It should be remembered that it is not an official record of the dynasty In the official records, we find that the independent sovereigns are described as the *mahārājādhirājas*, while the subordinate rulers e g governors etc are designated as the *mahārājas* In the coins, however, we often find that the designation of mahārāja has been loosely used So in order to determine the status of a Gupta sovereign, we have to consider very critically the official epigraphs of the dynasty, or, in other words, the epigraphs issued by the kings themselves or their officers '

of this tradition, we have to assume that the first two sovereigns were not independent potentates. It is, however, difficult to determine precisely whose subordinates they were. We have already seen that the Muruṇḍas were ruling in this region in the third century A.D., while the Purāṇas agree that before the Guptas came in possession of Magadha, the country had been under the rule of one Viśvasphāṇi, who, as the form of the name indicates, must have been a non-Indian, and possibly a Śaka.[8] From this we can possibly infer that the early Guptas were subordinate rulers under the Muruṇḍas, though, we admit, there is no definite proof about it. Hardly anything definite is known about the kings, Gupta and Ghatotkaca. Two seals, one with the legend *'Guptasya'* (in mixed Sanskrit and Prākrit) and the other with the Sanskrit legend *'Śrī-Guptasya'* may be ascribed to the first king of the dynasty.[9]

LICCHAVI RULE OVER MAGADHA ?

The Nepal inscription of Jayadeva II of the Licchavi dynasty, dated in the year 153, states that 23 generations before Jayadeva I, his ancestor Supuspa Licchavi was born in the city of Puspapura or Pātaliputra.[10] Relying on Fleet's theory about the dating of the Nepal epigraphs,[11] some scholars have concluded that Supuspa flourished in the beginning of the Christian era, and also that about the time of the rise of the Guptas, Pātaliputra was under the rule of the Licchavis[12] Apart from the fact that Fleet's theory about the era to which the Nepal records are to be referred is a wrong one, we can hardly infer that the Licchavis ruled over Magadha about that period, and that the early Gupta kings were subordinate rulers under the Licchavis, as some scholars think, from the mere statement that Licchavi Supuspa was born in Pātaliputra.

[8] *supra,* Ch vi. p. 146.
[9] *JRAS,* 1901, p 99; 1905, p 814.
[10] *IA,* ix, p 178
[11] *Corpus,* iii. pp 177f
[12] Jayaswal, History of India, p 112

CANDRA GUPTA I

Smith thinks that "the Licchavis were masters of Pāṭaliputra and Candra Gupta by means of his matrimonial alliance, succeeded to the power previously held by his wife's relatives.[13] Smith's conjecture is based on two evidences: (a) in the Gupta records, Samudra Gupta is described as *"Licchavi-dauhitra"*, proving indirectly that the marriage of Candra Gupta with the Licchavi Kumāra Devī was an event of great future importance; and (b) there are several coins or medals having "on the obverse the figures and names of Candra Gupta and Kumāra Devī, and on the reverse a goddess seated

[13] Jayaswal has made an attempt to show the Licchavi connection of the Guptas, on the basis of the drama *Kaumudīmahotsava* (*ABORI,* xii. p. 50, *JBORS,* xix p 113) While his theory has been taken by some scholars (*JBORS,* xxi p 77; xxii p 275) others have emphatically rejected the same (*IHQ,* xiv p 582 *IC.* ix. p 100; *JAHRS,* vi p 139; *Thomas Com. Vol* p. 115 etc). The drama relates that king Sundaravarman of Pātaliputra had an adopted son named Candasena, who with the help of the Licchavis killed the king and the latter's natural son Kalyānavarman fled to the forest where he continued to live under the care of Mantragupta, the minister of the deceased sovereign Later on, when Candasena was out to quell a rebellion Mantragupta caused a rising of the people at Pātaliputra which resulted in the overthrow of Candasena's power, and the uprooting of his dynasty Kalyānavarman was restored to his father's kingdom and married Kīrtimatī, the daughter of Kīrtisena, the king of Mathurā, and a moon-lit night celebration was held on the occasion of this happy matrimonial function This gave the drama its name of *Kaumudīmahotsava* Jayaswal identifies Candasena of the drama with Candra Gupta I and believes that thus his Licchavi connection is proved by literary evidences as well There are some facts, however, which go seriously against the theory: *first,* in the fifth act of the play it is stated that the dynasty of Candasena had been exterminated, while from the epigraphic evidences it is clear that the dynasty of Candra Gupta I ruled up to c 550 A D; *secondly,* the Yādava dynasty of Kīrtivarman ruling in Mathurā in the beginning of the fourth century A D goes against all the known facts of history. The numismatic evidences clearly show that the Nāgas and not the Yādavas had been ruling over Mathurā at this time Indeed, the drama has got little historical value being a work of fancy Similarly, we must reject the account of the *Bhavisyottara Purāna* (*JBORS,* xxx. p. 1), which is nothing but a modern forgery. (*IHQ,* xx p 345).

on a lion, along with the legend *Licchavayaḥ* (the Licchavis)". Allan suggested that these medals (or coins) were issued by Samudra Gupta to commemorate the marriage of his parents, while other scholars think that Candra Gupta issued them jointly with the Licchavis and their princess Kumāra Devī, his wife, and that "Kumāra Devī was a queen by her own right, and the proud Licchavis, to whose stock she belonged, must have been anxious to retain their individuality in the new Imperial states".[14] It is really difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion regarding the authorship "till the discovery of coins whose attribution to Candra Gupta I is beyond doubt".[15] But still in this connection we may note some important facts:

1. There is absolutely no evidence that the Licchavis were ruling at this period either in Magadha or in the Vaiśālī region. On the other hand, all the evidences tend to show that the Licchavis were now in Nepal. (Levi).
2. The mention of the term *"Licchavayaḥ"* on the coins shows that either the Licchavi people are meant or that "the Licchavis had a republican constitution". Now, the Licchavis of Nepal had at this period a monarchical constitution and hence the term can only refer to the Licchavi people.
3. Samudra Gupta takes pride in the fact that he was a *Licchavi-dauhitra*, but at the same time claims in his Allahabad record that Nepal, which was at this period ruled over by the Licchavis, paid respects and bore allegiance to him. This shows evidently that he had no respect for the Licchavi royal house.

From the above evidences we can only infer that Samudra Gupta was grateful and indebted to the Licchavi people and not to the Licchavi royal house, possibly because the former helped him in some of his conquests. This leads us to think

[14] *JRASB*, 1937, *Num. Suppl.* xlvii pp 105ff.
[15] *PHAI*, p 530.

that *Candra Gupta-Kumāra Devī* coins were issued by Samudra Gupta, as suggested by Allan, and Kumāra Devī may or may not have belonged to the Licchavi royal house. She was taken in respect more for her being a Licchavi by nationality, than for anything else.

As Candra Gupta I is given the title of mahārājādhirāja it is clear that he was an independent ruler, and possibly the Gupta era of 319-20 A.D. marks the year of his accession to the throne. Some scholars think that the Gupta era originated with Samudra Gupta, and this view possibly gains ground if his Nalanda plate of the year 5 can be regarded as genuine[16]. It may be mentioned here that the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-Mūla-kalpa*[17] begins the line of the Guptas with Samudra Gupta. But in that case his reign becomes a long one of 55 years, for we know definitely that his son Candra Gupta II came to the throne in 375 A D [18] Such long reigns are not unusual, but as on the coins we do not find the portrait of Samudra Gupta as an old man, it is possibly better to think that the era dates from the accession of Candra Gupta I.

One peculiar feature of the era, however, is that its use is not met with till the time of Candra Gupta II whose Mathura inscription[19] is dated in the year 61 It is really curious how an era had been in abeyance for 61 years since its inception. Was it started by Candra Gupta II to commemorate the foundation of the Gupta Empire in 319-20 A D.?

Candra Gupta I married the Licchavi Kumāra Devī and evidently freed the country of the foreign yoke of the Murundas. Whether his marriage contributed immediately in any way towards his independent status must remain uncertain in the present state of our knowledge, as we have already seen

The Allahabad Pillar inscription gives us a very detailed account of the conquests of Samudra Gupta both in the Āryāvarta and the Dakṣiṇāpatha, and it is significant that in the

[16] For the view that the Nalanda plate is not a spurious one as thought by Fleet, *IC*, x p 77; xi p 225

[17] *AMMK*, ed Jayaswal, p 48, Text, p 52

[18] *Select Ins*, p 269

[19] *ib.*, *Ep. Ind* xxi. pp. 1ff; *IHQ*, xviii, pp 271ff; *ABORI*, xviii. pp 166ff.

record there is no mention of any conquest by the king in the region extending from Kosam or Allahabad in the west to the Ganges in the east.[20] This shows that the region possibly extending from Allahabad to the Ganges in the east formed the empire of mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta I. Candra Gupta I evidently defeated the Magha kings of Kauśāmbī and Kośala and incorporated their territories within his own kingdom. Allan thinks that the verse of the *Vāyu Purāṇa* giving the account of the Gupta empire, is, in fact, a description of the empire of Candra Gupta I It will be seen that the above description does not mention Vaiśālī etc. lying in North Bihar. But if we take the term *Anu-Gaṅgā* as a distinct entity, meaning *the territories along the Ganges*, then there appears to be no difficulty.

[20] We shall see later on that Candravarman mentioned in the Allahabad record cannot be identified with the king of the same name as mentioned in the Susunia inscription

APPENDIX

A NOTE ON THE GUPTA ERA

Fleet's theory that the Gupta era began in 319-20 A.D. has been rejected by several scholars. Dr. Shāma Śastry thinks that the initial year of the Gupta era is 200-201 A.D.[1] Sri Govinda Pai wrote an article in the *Journal of Indian History*, Vols. xi & xii, wherein he propounded the theory that the era originated in 272-73 A.D.

There are at least three known data that prove beyond doubt that Fleet's theory is the correct one. They are as follows.

(i) The Mandasor inscriptions of Kumāra Gupta and Bandhuvarman dated Mālava year 493 = 436 A.D.[2]

(ii) The Ganjam Plates of Śaśāṅka of the Gupta year 300 = 619-20 A.D[3]

(iii) The defeat of the western ksatrapas and their final overthrow by the Gupta king Candra Gupta II as proved by the evidence of the coins.

The earliest known date of Kumāra Gupta is the year 96 as stated in the Bilsad inscription while his last known date G.E. 136 is found on one of his silver coins. Thus according to Fleet's theory the reign of Kumāra Gupta would extend from c. 414-455 A.D. The Mandasor inscription of 436 A.D. thus falls within his reign. The dates of Kumāra Gupta do not tally with the date in the Mandasor record if we think that the Gupta era started in 200-201 A.D. (Shāma Śastry) or in 272-73 A.D (Pai).

Similarly, we know that Śaśāṅka was a contemporary of Harsa who ruled from 606 A.D to 647 A.D This synchronism tallies only if we ascribe the date of the Ganjam Plate to the era of 319-20 A.D

As we shall see later on Candra Gupta II ruled from c.375 A.D to 414 A.D. according to the era the initial year of which has

[1] *Mysore Arch Report*, 1923.

[2] *Corpus*, iii pp 79f; *IC*, iii. p. 379; iv. pp 110, 262, 361; vi pp 110, 339

[3] *Ep Ind*, vi pp 143ff

been determined by Fleet. He put an end to the rule of the Śaka Satraps of Western India and issued silver coins imitating the coins of the vanquished. Now the last known date of the Śaka dynasty is 304 as found on the coins and if referred to the Śaka era it gives the date 382 A.D. which consequently falls within the reign of Candra Gupta II.

All these facts when considered together undoubtedly prove the correctness of Fleet's theory, which is based on the statement of Alberuni that the Gupta era was separate from the Śaka era by an interval of 241 years

III

The Expansion of Gupta Empire

SAMUDRA GUPTA

KACA PROBLEM

According to the Gupta epigraphs Candra Gupta I was succeeded by his son Samudra Gupta. The Allahabad Pillar inscription of his reign states that Samudra Gupta was selected for the throne by his father, because he was considered to be worthy or *ārya*, and the decision was publicly declared in an open assembly before the counsellors by asking the prince . *'Protect ye this earth'*. It is further stated that when this declaration was made his kinsmen of equal birth (*tulyakulaja*) be came pale-faced with disappointment, while the members of the council became exalted over the decision.

Recently, Dr. Chhabra has proposed the reading *'ehi ehī = ty=upaguhya . . . .'* in place of " *(Ā) ryyoh=ity=upaguhya*" and has translated the passage as "Come, Come . . . . 'protect thou the whole earth' ".[1] If we accept Chhabra's reading then it would appear that Candra Gupta I abdicated in favour of Samudra Gupta Such an interpretation seems to be supported also by *ll.* 13-14 of the Eran inscription[2]

Some scholars, however, think that the statement that the faces of his kinsmen of equal birth became pale with disappointment is the poetic representation of some trouble over the throne at the accession of Samudra Gupta. They further point out that the fragmentary *verses 5 & 6* of the Allahabad record, which describe how some were attracted to Samudra Gupta by his extraordinary deeds of valour, and others submitted after being afflicted by his prowess, support such a conjecture. There are several coins bearing the name Kāca and the legend *"Kāco gām avajitya divam karmabhiruttamair jayati"*, and it has been held that this Kāca was an elder brother of Samudra Gupta who

[1] *IC*, xiv, p 141

[2] *Corpus*, iii., p. 18.

occupied the throne, and after killing him Samudra Gupta became the king. Now, if we accept the view that Candra Gupta abdicated in favour of Samudra Gupta such a theory cannot arise. Further, these coins bear such a close resemblance to the coins of Samudra Gupta that Allan thought that "Kācha was the original name of the emperor and that he took the name Samudra Gupta in allusion to his conquests". This supposition is strengthened by the fact that while on the reverse of the Kāca coins there is the legend *"Sarvarājocchettā"*, the same epithet is applied to Samudra Gupta only, among the Gupta kings, in the official records of the dynasty. Further, the legend *"Kāco gām avajitya divam karmabhiruttamair jayati"* may be compared with the description of Samudra Gupta in *ll.* 29-30 of the Allahabad record and the legends on the *obv* of the Aśvamedha type of coins of the same king These facts evidently lead to the conclusion that Kāca was possibly another name of Samudra Gupta. It is not unlikely that Kāca acquired the name of Samudra Gupta after his conquests extended upto the ocean (*cf.* the description of Samudra Gupta in the Bilsad inscription of Kumāra Gupta I: *"Sarvvarājocchettuh .... caturudadhi-salilāsvāditayaśaso ...."*).[3]

It is difficult to determine exactly when Samudra Gupta ascended the throne. If Candra Gupta became king in 320 A D and then married Kumāra Devī then it is difficult to agree with the theories that Samudra Gupta became king in 335 or 325 A D.[4] We know that Candra Gupta II came to the throne in 375 A.D and thus allowing a margin of 25 years for his father's glorious reign we may tentatively conclude that Samudra Gupta came to the throne about 350 A.D. Further we have to remember the fact that inasmuch as Samudra Gupta was specially selected by his father for the throne, he must have been advanced in age and well-versed in the affairs of the state.

SAMUDRA GUPTA'S EPIGRAPHS

The Allahabad Pillar inscription composed by his sāndhi-

[3] *Select Ins*, p 278.
[4] Allan, *CGD.* p xxxii; *PHAI*[4] p. 445

vigrahika and mahādaṇḍanāyaka Harisena is the main source for studying the history of Samudra Gupta's reign. Cunningham thinks that the pillar containing the inscription was originally at Kauśāmbī and was afterwards moved from there to Allahabad by one of the early Musalman kings of Delhi. The points in favour of such a hypothesis are: (1) that the column contains a short Aśoka edict addressed to the rulers of Kauśāmbī; and (2) that the Chinese pilgrim Yuan-Chwang makes no mention of this column in his account of Po-lo-ye-kia i.e., Prayāga or Allahabad.[5] Fleet thought that the record was incised after the death of Samudra Gupta inasmuch as *ll.* 29-30 describe the fame of Samudra Gupta as reaching the abode of Indra, i.e., he was dead This theory has been controverted by Buhler who pointed out that the record contains no reference to the Aśvamedha sacrifice of Samudra Gupta, as proved by the evidence of his coins, and hence the record must have been executed before that event. Further, *ll* 29-30 really mean that the king's fame reached heaven and this cannot be interpreted as meaning that he was dead.[6]

There is another record of the king at Eran, Saugor District, Madhya Pradesh. Lines 1-6 of the record are entirely broken and lost and an indefinite number at the bottom is damaged.[7] One of the great peculiarities of this record is that in it Samudra Gupta is not described as Licchavi-dauhitra. This seems to support our conjecture that Samudra Gupta began to boast of his Licchavi connection and also issued the *Candra Gupta-Kumāra Devī* coins after he had received material help from the Licchavi people in the matter of his *digvijaya*. On this ground we are inclined to think that the Eran record is possibly earlier in date than the Allahabad Praśasti of Harisena.

There are two other records, one from Nalanda of the year 5 and another from Gaya of the year 9, referring to Samudra Gupta. The genuineness of both the records have been doubted though Dr R. C Majumdar is inclined to think that the

[5] *Corpus*, iii, p 2
[6] *Select Ins*, p. 259.
[7] *Corpus*, iii p 18, an improved reading of the text, *Select Ins*, p 261

first one may not be spurious. Nothing however can be said definitely on the point.

ORDER OF CAMPAIGNS

The Allahabad record contains a very detailed account of the conquests of Samudra Gupta. As in *ll.* 19-20 the conquests of the Dakṣiṇāpatha states are described followed by the description of the conquests of kings and states of North India (*ll* 21-23), J-Dubreuil concluded that Samudra Gupta conquered South India first and opines that Harisena has described the digvijaya of Samudra Gupta in chronological odrer[8] But if really we have to think of any chronological scheme in the description, we have to arrange the history of the digvijaya in the following order:

(a) First campaign in Āryāvarta (*ll.* 13-14).
(b) Campaign in Daksināpatha (*ll.* 19-20).
(c) Second campaign in Āryāvarta (*ll.* 21-23).

Available evidences seem to indicate the Samudra Gupta led really two campaigns in North India, though most of the scholars do not favour such a theory[9] on the ground that while *ll.* 13-14 of the Allahabad record state that Samudra Gupta violently uprooted (*unmūlya*) Acyuta, Nāgasena, a king of the Kota family etc., Acyuta Nāgasena are again referred to in *l* 21. Had they been *uprooted* in the first campaign how are they mentioned again in course of the supposed second one? In this connection we have to note the following points:

(a) The king of the Kota family is referred to in *l.* 14 but not again in *l.* 21.
(b) *L* 21 speaks of Nāgasena along with Gaṇapatināga

[8] *AHD*, p 61.

[9] In *ABORI*, ix p. 88, Heras states that Samudra Gupta undertook two campaigns in the Āryāvarta. In the first, he merely defeated the kings like Acyuta and Nāgasena, and in the second he violently exterminated them But as the Allahabad epigraph uses the expression *'unmūlya'* in connection with Acyuta and Nāgasena in *ll.*13-4, it shows that they were really exterminated in the first campaign. We cannot take the term *'unmūlya'* in the sense of being *'defeated'*.

whose coins have been found at Padam-Pawaya = ancient Padmāvatī, a centre of Nāga power according to the *Purāṇas*. Now, *Harsacarita* refers to the death of Nāgasena, the king of Padmāvatī.[10] As thus both Gaṇpatināga and Nāgasena belonged to the Nāga house of Padmāvatī, and as Samudra Gupta killed both of them, the latter must have attacked them at two different times, after one has succeeded the other.

(c) *L.* 14 informs us that the prince of the Kota family was captured while Samudra Gupta had been playing at the' city of Puspa i.e., Pāṭaliputra (*Yena .... Puspāhvaye krīdatā* etc.)[11] This is evidently the poetic way of stating that Samudra Gupta was a young man at the time of the conquest. It also indirectly refers to his earlier conquests.

From the above discussions it is thus clear that Samudra Gupta undertook two campaigns in North India, and further that the description of the North Indian kings in *ll* 21-23 is in the nature of *stock-taking*, containing names of kings who were conquered on different occasions. (cf. Gaṇapatınāga and Nāgasena).

In his conquests of South India, Samudra Gupta followed the ideal of *dharma-vıjaya*. He first defeated the kings and then re-instated them in their own kingdoms, a policy which reminds us of the procedure followed by Raghu ın the same region as described by Kālidāsa.[12] After a critical study of Samudra Gupta's South Indian campaigns, J-Dubreuil came to the conclusion that Samudra Gupta was opposed by a confederacy of kings of the Eastern Deccan near the Colair Lake and being repulsed, abandoned his conquests he had made in the coast of Orissa and returned home[13] The Allahabad record, however, clearly shows that Samudra Gupta advanced in

[10] *HC Trans.*, p 192.
[11] *Select Ins*, p. 256, f.n. 2.
[12] *Raghuvamśam*, iv. 43.
[13] *AHD*, p. 60-1

the south as far as Kāñchī, and we do not know on what ground J-Dubreuil drew the above conclusion. We should note, however, that though the *praśasti* of Harisena claims that he defeated all the kings of Dakṣiṇāpatha (*sarva-Dakṣiṇāpatha-rāja*), the location of the South Indian states, explicitly mentioned as being conquered, shows that Samudra Gupta really subjugated only a portion of the Eastern and the North-Eastern Deccan. Levi has shown that since the second century A.D. there sprang up many good ports on the eastern coast of South India,[14] and Samudra Gupta evidently wanted to have them under his control. The statement of the Allahabad record that the islanders (*sarvadvīpavāsibhih*) also recognised his supremacy, though it appears to be an exaggeration in itself, may have some amount of truth and this became possible by Samudra Gupta's control of the Eastern Deccan region. It also may have contributed to a great extent in keeping the Vākāṭakas under control who were now becoming the dominant power in the Maharastra region.[15] With the same political purpose he evidently conquered the Forest Countries, extending from Jubbalpur to Chota Nagpur (*paricārikṛta-sarvataviīkarājasya*). The Vākātaka policy also loomed large during the time of Samudra Gupta's son Candra Gupta II who entered into a matrimonial alliance with them by giving in marriage his daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā to Rudrasena II, son of Pṛthivīsena I.

FIRST CAMPAIGN IN NORTH INDIA

In his first campaign in North India, Samudra Gupta defeated Acyuta, Nāgasena and a prince of the Kota family. In the Allahabad record, after the word Nāgasena, there occurs the letter *ga* and then a lacuna, which Dr. Sircar thinks, can be filled up by *Ganapatyādīn-nṛpān saṅgare*.[16] If we accept the proposed reading we have to assume that Samudra Gupta had to

[14] Levi, *Ptolemy, Niddesa and Bṛhatkathā*, Trans. P C. Bagchi, *Sino-Indian Studies*, Vol. II, 1946, pp 61ff.
[15] For the Vākātakas, *Appendix II*
[16] *Select Ins*, p 256, f.n. 1.

fight in the Padmāvatī region twice in course of the same campaign inasmuch as both Nāgasena and Gaṇpatināga belonged to the same house. Acyuta probably ruled in the Ahicchatra region (modern Ramnagar and Bareilly District) where copper coins bearing the legend Acyu have been found.[17] About Nāgasena the *Harṣcarita* states: "At Padmāvatī occurred the doom of Nāgasena born of the Nāga family, who was foolish enough to have the secrets of his policy discussed in the presence of the Śārikā bird which declared them aloud".[18] The *Purāṇas* describe Nāgasena as ruling over Padmāvatī and Mathura.[19] Coins bearing the name of Kota have been found in E. Punjab and Delhi and the dynasty may have held sway in the Upper Gangetic valley region.[20]

Some scholars think that Nāgasena, Acyuta and the prince of the Kota family entered into a league against Samudra Gupta who defeated their combined forces in a battle at Kauśāmbī [21] Of this, however, there is no evidence at all.

CAMPAIGN IN SOUTH INDIA

By the above conquests, Samudra Gupta evidently got some hold over the Ganges-Jumna valley, and thus feeling secured in his position, turned his attention towards South-India. As already stated, *ll.* 19-20 specify the names of the kings of Dakṣiṅā-

[17] Allan, *CGD*, p xxii, *Catalogue*, p lxxix Altekar observes "A king named Achyuta had risen to power in Ahichchhatra (Rohilkhand) by middle of the fourth century A.D His coin-type bears a close resemblance to that of some Nāga coins and it is not improbable that he was himself a Nāga ruler, perhaps a scion of a collateral branch of the Mathurā family" (*VGA*, pp 36-7)

[18] *cf. supra*, f n 10

[19] Padmāvatī, as already stated, has been identified with the present Padam Pawayaya, 25 miles north-east of Narwar in the apex of the confluence of the Sindhu and the Para; see also *EHI*, p 300

[20] The *Kota* coins resemble the *'Śruta'* coins attributed to a ruler of Śrāvasti There is absolutely no proof that the Kotas ruled over Pātaliputra at the time of the rise of the Guptas as Jayaswal thinks. (History of India, 150 A D—350 A D, p 113)

[21] Jayaswal, *ib*, pp. 132f.

patha who were defeated but re-instated by Samudra Gupta. They are as follows:

1. Mahendra of Kośala. This is undoubtedly Dakṣiṇa-Kośala and comprised the districts of Bilaspur, Raipur and Sambalpur. From the Rajim C.P. inscription of Tivaradeva of c. 800 A.D. it appears that Śrīpura i.e., Sirpur was the capital of the state.[22]

2. Vyāghrarāja of Mahākāntāra. Bhandarkar thinks that this Vyāghrarāja is almost certainly identical with Vyāghra, father of Jayanātha, of the Ucchakalpa dynasty, that ruled over the Jaso and Ajaigarh states in Bundelkhand[23] But this would place the kingdom of Mahākāntāra to the north of the Vindhyas and not in the Dakṣiṇāpatha, as the Allahabad record asserts. G. Ramdas identifies Mahākāntāra with the Jhad-khand tracts of Ganjam and Vizagapatam.[24] But as it is mentioned immediately after the kingdom of Kośala, it appears to have been a wild tract nearby We prefer its identification with Mahāvana, mentioned in an old inscription, and which is identified with the present Jeypore forest region in Orissa.[25]

3. Mantarāja of Kurāla Kurāla has been variously identified with (a) Colair lake, the Kunāla of the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II,[26] (b) Sonpur district of M.P., "the province round about Yayātinagara where the author of the *Pavanadūta* locates the Keralas",[27] and (c) Korada in South India.[28] We prefer the second identification as it is nearer to the Jeypore forest tract, inasmuch as in the Allahabad record Kurāla is mentioned immediately after Mahākāntāra.[29]

[22] *Suc Sat.*, p 129

[23] *IHQ*, i. p 251; cf R K Mookerjee, *The Gupta Empire*, p. 21

[24] *IHQ*, i p. 684

[25] *JAHRS*, i. p. 228

[26] Dr Raychaudhuri points out that "Kaurāla cannot be Kolleru or Colair which must have been included within the territory of Hastivarman of Vengī mentioned separately". (*PHAI*, p 539)

[27] *Ep Ind* xi p 189

[28] *BSOS*, II, iii, p 569

[29] Dr Raychaudhuri thinks that the reading in the *Pavanadūtaṃ* is not beyond doubt.

4. Mahendragiri of Pistapura. Piṣṭapura is the modern Pitliapuram in the Godavari district. It is also mentioned in the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II.[30]

5. Svāmidatta of Koṭṭura. J-Dubreuil thinks that it is to be identified with Kothoor in the Ganjam district.

Note—1. The expression *Paiṣṭapuraka-Mahendragiri-Kauttuiaka-Svāmidatta* has been interpreted by G. Ramdas to mean Svāmidatta who had his seat at Pistapura and at Kottura near Mahendragiri (Northern part of the Eastern Ghat Ranges). "This informs us that Svāmidatta was the king of the two territories: (1) the one, of which Pisthapura (Pithapur) was the capital; and, (2) the other, of which Kottura near Mahendra was the capital, i.e., Kaliṅga"[31]

6. Damana of Eraṇḍapalla. Its identification with Erandol, the chief town of a sub-division of the same name in the Khandesh district, as proposed by Fleet, is certainly wrong, as J-Dubreuil points out, who thinks that Erandapalla should be identified with the town Erandapali near Chicacole on the coast of Orissa mentioned in the Siddhantam plates of Devendravarman.[32]

7. Visṇugopa of Kāñcī. Kāñcī is the modern Conjeeveram in the Chinglput district, Madras. Visṇugopa was a king of the Pallava dynasty.[33]

[30] *Ep Ind.* vi. p 2-3

[31] *IHQ,* i p 681. Fleet and others maintain that Mahendragiri cannot be the name of any person specially of a king The view, however, appears to be an unacceptable one, for, as Dr Raychaudhuri points out, we find that the name of Kumāragiri is given to a chief of Kondavidu, whose territories included a portion at least of the Godāvarī district (*PHAI,* p. 538, f n. 2). There is also another Kottura at the foot of the hills in the Vizagapatam district (*Vizag Dist. Gas* i p. 137).

[32] G Ramdas thinks that Erandapalla may be identified with Yendipalli in Vizagapatam or Endapilli. in Ellore Taluk *IHQ,* i p. 683.

[33] For Viṣṇugopa, *Suc Sat* pp 151ff, 161ff, 177ff Some scholars think that the Pallavas were foreigners, but this view is no longer accepted

8. Nīlarāja of Avamukta. Nothing is known eithei about the king or the country.[34]

9. Hastıvarman of Veṅgī. Vengī may be identified with the region round Vegi or Pedda-Vegi, a village in the Ellore taluka of the Godavari district. Hastıvarman was certainly the king of the Sālankāyana dynasty whose record has been found at Pedda-Vegi.[35]

10. Ugrasena of Pālakka. J-Dubreuıl has identified Pālakka with a capital-place of the same name which was situated to the south of the Krsṇā and which ıs mentioned in many Pallava copper plates.[36]

11. Kuvera of Devarāstra Its identıficatıon with Mahārāṣṭra as proposed by Smith and others is certainly wrong. "It must be identified with the provınce of Devarāstra (=Yellamanchili tract) mentioned in a copper-plate grant found ın the district of Vizagapatam.[37].

12. Dhanañjaya of Kusthalapura. Barnett ıdentifies Kusthalapura with Kuttalur, near Polur, in North Arcot.[38]

Some scholars think that after hıs first Āryāvarta war Samudra Gupta left the Yamunā valley and marched through the modern Rewa and Jubbulpore regions and attacked the South Kośala country. This would imply that Samudra Gupta must have conquered the *Ātavıkarājya,* comprising wild tracts near

[34] R K Mookerjee thinks that "Avamukta must have been a small kingdom ın the neighbourhood of Kanchi and Vengi. Nīlarāja may be connected wıth Nılapallim in Godavarı district He was also another member of the Pallava confederation fought by Samudra Gupta. The kingdom of Kanchi in those days embraced the whole territory from the mouth of the Krıshna to the south of the river Palar and sometımes even Kaveri To the east of this terrıtory lay the kingdoms of Vengı, Palakka and Avamukta (*The Gupta Empıre,* p. 22) Dr. Raychaudhuri poınts out that the *Brahma Purāna* (Ch 113, 22ff) mentıons an *Avimukta-ksetra* on the bank of the Gautamī, i.e, Godāvarī. (*PHAI,* p 540)

[35] For Hastivarman, *Suc Sat*, pp 68ff

[36] cf *IHQ,* i p 686.

[37] *AHD,* p. 60, *ASIR,* 1908-9, p 123 Sometımes Piṣtapura formed a part of Devarāstra, *Ep Ind* xxiii p. 57.

[38] *Calcutta Review,* 1924, p 253n Smith wrongly thinks that Kusthalapura is a mıstake for Kuśasthalapura, a name of the holy city of Dwaraka.

Jubbulpore, before he began his campaign against the Southern kings. In the Allahabad record, however, "*Sarvātavika-rājasya*" is mentioned after the enumeration of the kings of Āryāvarta (*l*.21) supposed to have been conquered in the second *Āryāvarta* war. It is, therefore, better to think with Jayaswal that Samudra Gupta descended swiftly by the Sambhalpur route and then attacking South Kośala etc. proceeded towards the Pallava kingdom of Kāñchī. He has further made some interesting inferences regarding this Southern campaign. (a) that the list of the Southern potentates in the Allahabad record includes the names of kings as well as of District Officers, (b) that Samudra Gupta fought his decisive battle in the Colair Lake region (*cf*. J-Dubreuil), (c) that the Southern potentates had been grouped under two chief leaders—Mantarāja of Kurāla leading Svāmidatta and Damana of Eraṇḍapalla, while Viṣnugopa of Kāñchī led Nīlarāja of Avamukta, Hastivarman of Vengī, Ugrasena of Pālakka Kuvera of Devarāstra and Dhanañjaya of Kusthalapura [39]

SECOND CAMPAIGN IN NORTH INDIA

The statement of the Allahabad record that the Daksiṇāpatha conquest of Samudra Gupta was marked by three distinct features, viz, *grahaṇa* (capture of the enemy), *moksa* (liberating him), and *anugraha* (favouring him by reinstating him in his kingdom), followed by a description of nine kings of Āryāvarta whose kingdoms were incorporated in his own dominion, proves indirectly that when Samudra Gupta was engaged in his southern conquest there were fresh outbreaks in the north and so the Gupta monarch hurried back to meet the new situation. The kings who became victims of this extermination are thus described in *l*. 21 : Rudradeva, Matila, Nāgadatta, Candravarman, Canapatināga, Nāgasena, Acyuta, Nandin, Balavarman etc. As we have already stated this description is of the nature of stock-taking one (*supra*, p. 181) and at least Nāgasena and Acyuta had already been exterminated in the first Āryāvarta

[39] Jayaswal, *l c*, pp 135-9

war. These kings are described as the rulers of Āryāvarta (Āryāvartarāja). Now, in the *Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra, Vaśistha Dharmasūtra* and the *Mahābhāsya* of Patañjali, Āryāvarta is described as the region lying to the east of Ādarśa or Adarśana i.e , the place where the river Sarasvatī disappears in the sand, the present Hissar in the Punjab ; to the west of Kālakavana, usually identified with a wild tract near Allahabad ; to the south of the Himālayas ; and to the north of the Pāriyātra i.e., the western part of the present Vindhya range[40] In the *Manusmrti,* on the other hand, Āryāvarta denotes the land between the Himālayas and the Vindhyas and between the western and the eastern seas.[41]

Before we proceed further we have to determine in which of the above two senses the term has been used in the Allahabad record As the above kings of Āryāvarta are distinguished from the kings of Samatata (South-East Bengal) and the tribal states like the Mālavas (Mewar, Tonk, and adjoining regions of South-East Rajputana) etc , we can easily infer that Harisena must have used it in the sense in which it is described in the earlier *Dharmasūtras* and the *Mahābhāsya* of Patañjali Thus it appears that the territories of the above nine kings lay to the west of the Prayāga which was the western boundary of the empire of Samudra Gupta's father. (*supra,* pp. 145-6) In other words, Samudra Gupta's southern campaigns caused him to lose the conquests in North India that he had achieved after the death of his father

Of the above nine kings, the dominions of the following five, viz , Rudradeva,[42] Matila,[43] Nāgadatta, Nandin and

[40] *Baudhāyana Dh S* I i 2 9, *Vaśistha Dh* S 1 8; *Mahābhāṣya* II 4 10

[41] *Manu-Samhitā* II 22

[42] Rudradeva's identification with Rudrasena I Vākātaka, as suggested by Dikshit, seems to be untenable cf *The Gupta Empire,* p 23 His identification with Rudradeva whose coins have been found at Kosam may be accepted, and this would explain also why he is mentioned first among the Āryāvarta monarchs in the Allahabad record

[43] "It has been suggested that Matila may be identified with Mattila of the seal found in Bulandshahr, but the absence of any honorific on the

Balavarman[44] cannot be located at present with any amount of certainty. Acyuta and Nāgasena have already been discussed above in connection with the first Āryāvarta war. The coins of Gaṇapatināga have been found at Marwar and Besnagar and thus he belonged to the Nāga house of Padmāvatī and was possibly a successor of Nāgasena. He is also described as the Dhārādhīśa, lord of Dhārā. In fact, from the account of the *Bhāvaśataka,* I.v. 800, it appears that he was a king of considerable importance and may have been the leader of the revolt against Samudra Gupta.[45] Candravarman has been identified with the king of that name whose record has been found at Susunia in Bankura district, West Bengtl.[46] But as we have already stated, the nine kings including Candravarman possibly ruled to the west of Allahabad and hence this identification can hardly be accepted King Candravarman of the Susunia record may have been conquered by Candra Gupta I, whose dominion extended in the east upto the Ganges. (*supra*, p. 158).

As a result of this war of extermination the empire of Samudra Gupta now included the U P and a portion of Madhyapradesh. The southern boundary of this empire was further extended by the conquest of the Forest Countries (*l.* 21). Two inscriptions dated in the year 199 & 209 of the Gupta era from the Baghelkhand regions describe king Hastin as ruling over Dabhāla together with the eighteen forest kingdoms.[47] The *Āṭavikarājya,* therefore, denoted Dabhāla and the wild region around, corresponding to the territory round present Jubbulpore. As a result of this conquest the Narmadā evidently became the southern boundary of the Gupta empire.

latter suggests that it is a private seal and not one of royal personage". *IHQ,* i p 254

[44] Nāgadatta, Nandin and Balavarman may have been Nāga rulers

[45] The coins of Ganapatināga have been found at Mathura But as Mathura was an important centre of pilgrimage and trade, we cannot infer from the mere finds of coins in such a place that Ganapatināga was a ruler of Mathura only. His empire may have been a larger one including Mathura itself Some scholars have doubted the authenticity of the *Bhāvaśataka* (IHQ, xii p 135).

[46] For Candravarman of the Susunia record, *supra*, pp 158-59

[47] *Corpus,* iii, p. 112; *Ep. Ind.,* viii., p. 284

SUBORDINATE BORDER STATE

These conquests evidently made Samudra Gupta one of the most powerful rulers of North India and we are informed that five kingdoms and nine tribal states lying on the frontier of the dominion were anxious to enter into friendly relations with him by paying taxes, obeying his orders and performing obeisance in person to the great emperor. These five kingdoms were :

(i) Samataṭa. It is taken as comprising the delta of the Ganges and the Brahmaputra, "of which the Jessore district forms the central portion". Dr. B C. Sen points out that "from the *Records* and the *Biography*, describing the itinerary of Hiuen-tsang, the position of Samatata in relation to the several countries situated in its neighbourhood may be thus indicated. It lay to the south of Kāmarūpa (in Assam) to the south-east of Karṇasuvarṇa (in the Murshidabad district), and to the east of Tāmralipta (in the Midnapore district) ".[48]

2. Davāka It has not yet been satisfactorily identified Fleet thinks that it was the ancient name of Dacca, while Smith locates it in North Bengal. Some scholars identify it with the Kopili valley in Assam where there is still a place named Dabok. On the evidence of Ptolemy's *Geographike,* Col. Gerini identifies it with Upper Burma.[49]

3 Kāmarūpa. It signifies roughly the modern Assam, the central portion of which is still known as Kāmrūp. It is believed that the contemporary of Samudra Gupta in Kāmarūpa was either Pusyavarman or Samudravarman, remote ancestors of Bhāskaravarman, the contemporary of Harṣa.[50]

4 Nepāla. The ancient kingdom of Nepāla comprised the region lying between the basins of the Gandak and Kosi, which is still known as "the valley of Nepal." It is mentioned for the first time possibly in the *Arthaśāstra* of Kautilya, where we have references to "*Naipālakam*" meaning a special kind of

[48] *SHAIB,* p 91
[49] *ib.,* p 209
[50] *infra,* Ch ix

blankets made of sheep's wool and manufactured in Nepal[51] At the time of Samudra Gupta the Licchavis were the ruling dynasty in the country.[52]

5. Kartṛpura. It has been variously identified with (a) Kartarpur in Jalandhar District, (b) the territory of the Katuria Raj of Kumaon, Garhwal and Rohilkhand, and, (c) Kahror, between Multan and Lohni.[53]

Among the nine tribal states which submitted to Samudra Gupta, the most important were the Mālavas, Ārjunāyanas, and Yaudheyas. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that at the time of Samudra Gupta the Mālavas probably occupied Mewar, Tonk and the adjoining regions of South-East Rajasthan.[54] The Yaudheyas, as we have already seen, became very powerful in the middle of the second century A.D and possibly played a part in bringing the Kusāṇa rule to an end into the interior of India. During the time of Samudra Gupta they possibly occupied the territory extending from Northern Rajasthan to South-Eastern Punjab.[55] Allan thinks that the lands of the Ārjunāyanas probably lay within the triangle Delhi—Jaipur—Agra.[56] From the Allahabad record it appears that in the fourth century they

[51] *Arthaśāstra,* ed Ganapati Sastri, Bk ii p 193.

[52] *infra,* Ch ix

[53] *Ep Ind* xiii. p 114, *EHI, p* 302 n; *IHQ,* i. p 257; *JRAS,* 1898, p 198

[54] *VGA,* p 131 Dr Altekar points out· "It is usually held that the careers of Yaudheya, the Madra, the Ārjunāyana and the Mālava republics mentioned in Samudra-gupta's Allahabad inscription came to an end owing to the imperialistic ambition and expansion of the Guptas There is, however, no definite evidence to support this view Samudra-gupta only claims that these republics accepted his overlordship and paid him tribute This is quite compatible with internal autonomy, and it is quite possible that the republics may have continued their existence during the reigns of Candra-gupta II and Kumāra-gupta I. They may well have continued their semi-independent existence down to the middle of the 5th century A D, when they appeared to have been engulfed in the Hūna avalanche" (*ib*, pp 32-3)

[55] Dr Bhandarkar thinks that "at this time, they appeared to have occupied Mewar and Kotah of south-eastern Rajputana and the parts of Central India adjoining them" (*IHQ,* i p 257).

[56] Allan, *Catalogue,* p lxxxiii

were living outside Āryāvarta. They possibly may be located somewhere near Jaipur, between Bharatpur and Ajmir.

Of lesser importance were the tribal states of Madraka, Ābhīra, Prārjuna, Sanakānīka, Kāka and Kharapārika. The Madrakas had originally their capital at modern Sialkot in the Punjab and hence they may be located between the Ravi and the Chenub rivers.[57] The Ābhīras were a foreign tribe that entered India possibly after Alexander's invasion They are mentioned in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, the *Periplus* and the *Geographike* of Ptolemy An Ābhīra king Iśvarasena ruled in the Mahārāṣtra region about 248 A.D. During the time of Samudra Gupta they possibly had a republican constitution and have been located by Smith in the province of Ahirwada between Jhansi and Bhilsa.[58] The Prārjunas are mentioned in the *Arthaśāstra* and have been placed by Bhandarkar near Narsingarh, not far from Bhilsa [59] The Sanakānīkas are mentioned in the Udayagiri Cave inscription of Candra Gupta II of the year 82, and thus may be located in the Isagarh District, Gwalior, near Bhilsa [60] The Kākas also lived nearby evidently in Sañchi, which was known as Kākanādabota.[61] Kharapārikas are taken by Bhandarkar to be the Kharparas mentioned in the Batihagadh inscription and may be "located in the Damoh District of C.P.".[62]

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Allahabad inscription then gives the names of some independent foreign countries as entering into relationship with Samudra Gupta in the following words:

" whose (Samudra Gupta's) binding together of the

[57] For the Madras, *supra*, p 163

[58] *JRAS*, 1897, p 891

[59] *IHQ*, i p 258

[60] *Select Ins.*, pp 271-2.

[61] cf *"Kākanādabota-Śrī-mahāvihāre"*, *Select Ins*, p. 273 "Kākanādabota was apparently the old name of the Sanchi region".

[62] *PHAI*, p 546; *IHQ*, i p 258; *Ep. Ind* xii p. 46, Kharparapadraka, *DHNI*. i p 586

(whole) world, by means of the amplitude of the vigour of (his) arm, was effected by the acts of respectful service, such as offering themselves as sacrifices, bringing presents of maidens, (giving) Garuda-tokens, (surrendering) the enjoyment of their own territories, soliciting (his) commands, &c, (rendered) by the Daivaputras, Shāhis, Shāhānushāhis, Śakas, and Muruṇḍas, and by the people of Simhala and all (other) dwellers in islands ....". (Fleet, *Corpus*, iii. p. 14).

We have quoted the above translation of Fleet as it involves some important questions of interpretation The expression *Daivaputra-sāhi-sāhānusāhi* has been split up into three parts as if each denotes a separate entity Such an interpretation appears to be hardly satisfactory Bhandarkar points out. "It is, however, forgotten that the initial word is not Devaputra but Daivaputra, a *taddhita* form, which shows that the term cannot stand by itself but must be taken along with what follows. If this is a correct view, Daivaputra had better be taken along not only with Shāhi but also Shāhānushāhi, so as to make the whole correspondent with the full royal insignia Devaputra Mahārāja Rājātirāja, not only of the eastern Imperial Kushāna family but also of the Later Great Kushāṇas, or Kushāṇaputras as they called themselves."[63] Similarly, there is some uncertainty regarding the compound expression Śakamurunda. Konow has pointed out that the term Muruṇḍa has twofold sense: *first*, it refers to a particular branch of the Śakas, and *secondly*, it is equivalent to the Chinese term *wang*, meaning king or lord.[64] We have already seen that before the rise of the Guptas the Muruṇḍas had been ruling in Eastern India and a Muruṇḍa habitation at Lampāka (modern Laghman) is referred to in the *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* of Hemacandra. It is not unlikely that these Muruṇḍas of Laghman region entered into some sort of diplomatic relationship with the Gupta monarch, otherwise we have to think only of the Śaka lords (*wang*) of Western India, the descendants of the Great Rudradāman

It is really curious to think that the Later Kusāṇas, Śakas

[63] *IHQ*, i. p. 259
[64] *SI*, p. 3; *CII*, II i p xxf

and the king or people of Ceylon should have entered into relationship with Samudra Gupta that involved (i) *ātmanivedanam* (offering their own persons for service to the emperor), (ii) *kanyopāyanadāna* (gifts of maidens) and (iii) *Garutmadānka-sva-viṣaya-bhukti-śāsana-yācana* (applications for charters bearing the Garuda seal for the enjoyment of their own territories). Here we have nothing but hyperbolic exaggerations and there is no reason to think that the account implies *Treaties of Alliance and Service*. An example will make the whole thing clear. According to the Chinese author, Wang Hiuen-tse, the king of Ceylon, named Chi-mi-kia-po-mo or Sri Meghavarna, once sent two Buddhist monks to Bodh-Gaya, but the pilgrims had to face great inconvenience for want of suitable accommodation. To remove this difficulty for the future pilgrims the king of Ceylon sent an embassy with presents to Samudra Gupta asking for his permission to build at Bodh-Gaya a monastery for the use of Ceylonese pilgrims. The permission was at once granted.[65] Evidently this simple fact has been twisted in the epigraph to mean that the king of Ceylon entered into a subordinate alliance with the Gupta monarch Similarly, there is no evidence at all to show that the Śaka satraps of the Western India in any way showed respect for the Garuda token, though it is not unlikely that during the time of Samudra Gupta the Śaka house had been passing through some crisis and it may have solicited the help of Samudra Gupta. The Śaka contemporary of the Gupta monarch was evidently Rudrasena III whose known dates range from A.D. 348 to 378. His coins may be divided into two groups—(i) the dates of which range from 348 A.D. to 351 A.D., and (ii) the dates of which fall between 364 A.D. and 378 A.D. The thirteen years which fall between 351 A.D. and 364 A.D. were probably marked by some political disturbance during which the coinage ceased. There are some lead coins, however, the dates of which range from 358 A.D. to 372 A.D., and they belong therefore, though not entirely, to the period during which no silver coins are found. There is hardly any evidence, however, to show that the ksatrapa dominion had

[65] Levi, *JA*, 1900, pp 316ff, 401ff.

to face any foreign invasion during the period. It is not unlikely that it was passing through some economic crisis when Rudrasena III may have sought help from the Gupta emperor.[66]

The Kuṣāṇa contemporary of Samudra Gupta was Grumbates, who is described as "the king of the Chionitae, of middle age and wrinkled limbs, but of a grand spirit and already distinguished for many victories". In c 358-60 A D he helped Shahpur II, the Sassanid king, against the Romans in the siege of Amida. There is no evidence, however, that Grumbates in any way came into contact with Samudra Gupta.[67] In the middle of the fourth century A D, however, the Peshawar region passed under the Little Kusāṇas whose chief Kidāra for the time being, acknowledged the suzerainty of the Sassanian monarch. It is supposed that with the help of Samudra Gupta he ultimately became independent and even defeated a Sassanid army in 367-8 A D Now, he consolidated his power in Gandhāra, Kashmir and the Western and Central Punjab and appointed viceroys to rule over the distant parts of his empire Kusāna type of coins with the name of Samudra has also been found but it is difficult to determine the exact significance of the legend.[68]

The mention of *sarvadvīpavāsin* in the Allahabad record is indeed very interesting. It evidently shows that the Hindu colonies in South-East Asia maintained close contact with their mother-country in the Gupta age Dr. R. C Majumdar points out that the Javanese text *Tantri-kāmandaka* states that mahārāja Aiśvaryapāla of the Ikṣvāku race traced his genealogy to the family of Samudra Gupta [69]

HORSE SACRIFICE

It was evidently at the conclusion of his campaigns that Samudra Gupta performed the horse-sacrifice as proved by the

[66] *SI*, p 69; *supra*, p 156

[67] cf Allan, *CGD*, p xxvii, *supra*, p 163

[68] *supra*, p 163.

[69] "Some control over the islands in the neighbouring seas is possibly hinted at in the epithet *Dhanada-Varunendrāntakasama*, the equal of Dha–

evidence of his Aśvamedha type of coins. In the Poona plates he is given the epithet *anekāśvamedhayājin*, showing possibly that he performed more than one horse-sacrifice. On the obverse of these coins we find "horse standing *l.* before a sacrificial post, from which pennons fly over its back" while the reverse presents "the chief queen standing *l.*, wearing loose robe and jewellery etc ". The queen figured here has been identified with Dattā or Dattādevī, mother of Candra Gupta II. On the *Rev.* of all these coins there is the legend *Aśvamedha-parākramaḥ*, while on the *Obv.* we can distinguish at least two different types :[70]

(a) "*Rājādhirājaḥ pṛthivīṃ avitvā divaṃ jayatyapratıvāryavīrya*".

(b) "*Pṛthivīm vijitya divam jayatyāhṛta-vājimedhaḥ*".

The above two different specimens show evidently that they were issued on two different occasions. Can we infer from it that Samudra Gupta really performed more than one Aśvamedha sacrifice, as hinted indirectly in the Poona plates of his grand-daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā?

FXTENT OF EMPIRE AND ADMINISTRATION

Dr. R C. Majumdar describes the extent of Samudra Gupta's empire in the following words:

"It comprised nearly the whole of Northern India, with the exclusion of Kashmir, Western Punjab, Western Rajputana, Sind and Gujrat, together with the highlands of Chattisgarh and

nada (Kuvera, lord of wealth, guardian of the north), Varuna (the Indian Sea-god the guardian of the west), Indra, king of the celestials and guardian of the east, and Antaka (Yama, god of death, and guardian of the south). The comparison of Samudra Gupta with these deities is apposite and possibly refers not only to his conquests in all directions, but his possession of immense riches, *suzerainty over the seas*, the spread of his fame to the celestial region and his extirpation of various kings Inscriptions discovered in the Trans-Gangetic Peninsula and the Malaya Archipelago testify to the activities of Indian navigators (e g. the Mahānāvika from Raktamṛttikā mentioned in a Malayan epigraph) and military adventurers in the Gupta age". (*PHAI*, p 547, f n. 1)

[70] Allan, *CGD*, pp 21f. Altekar, *Bayana Hoard*, pl. xxxiii.

Orissa and a long stretch of territory along the eastern coast extending as far south as Chingleput and probably even further".[71] This was undoubtedly the sphere of his influence but the area directly under his rule seems to have comprised roughly the present U P, Bihar, West Bengal and a portion of the Vindhyan tracts. The Allahabad record mentions the following offices or officials who took part in the administration :

1. *Khādyatapākika,* Officer controlling the superintendence of the Royal Kitchen.
2. *Sāndhivigrahika,* Minister for Peace and War.
3. *Kumārāmātya,* Minister in attendance on the Prince.
4. *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka,* the Chief of the Police and Criminal Judge.

Harisena, the writer of the Allahabad praśasti, combined in himself all the above four offices. His father Dhruvabhūti was also a *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka,* while another *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka* was Tilabhaṭṭaka. The different types of the coins of Samudra Gupta throw interesting light on the career of the king and they may be summarised as follows : (a) The *Garuḍa* types mark his victory over the Nāgas, *Garuda being* the devourer of the nāgas or serpents; (b) The *Tiger* and the *River-Goddess* (*Makaravāhini Gaṅgā*) types indicate his conquest in the valley of the Ganges, "with its swampy and forest regions which were the abode of the royal Bengal tiger" ; (c) the *Candra Gupta—Kumāra Devī* coins having on the Rev. the figure of a Goddess seated on a lion, evidently *Durgā Siṃhavāhanā,* who is also known as *Vindhyavāsinī* or *Haimavatī* "may point to the extension of the Gupta dominions to the Vindhya and the Himavat".[72]

Samudra Gupta's qualities of head and heart as described in details in the Allahabad record can hardly be taken in its face value since it was written by the court-poet whose aim always is to extol his master.[73] Thus he is described as a *kavi-*

[71] *VGA,* p. 140

[72] cf. *PHAI,* p 551

[73] See an article by Dr. R. K. Mookerjee on the many-sided qualities and character of Samudra Gupta, as deduced from the evidence of the epigraphs and coins, *IC,* ix pp 77ff.

rāja and as the composer of a large number of poetry (*bahuka-vitā*). It is really curious in that case that not a single composition of the king has been handed down to posterity even in the form of quotations by other authors, though it is stated that he gathered at his court the literary masters. There may, however, be some basis of fact in the statement that he "put to shame the preceptor of the lord of Gods and Tumburu and Nārada and others by his sharp and polished intellect and choral skill and musical accomplishments". This reminds us of his "Lyrist type" of coins which represents the king, seated cross-legged on high-backed couch and playing on a lyre or lute which lies on his knees.

In conclusion, we may note a Standard type coin of Samudra Gupta having on the Rev. the legend *Śrī Vikramaḥ*;[74] its exact significance is not clear, but it may possibly show that he took the title of *Vikramāditya* like his son.

RĀMA GUPTA

According to the epigraphic records, Samudra Gupta was succeeded by his son Candra Gupta II, born of his chief-queen Dattādevī. Recently, some scholars have come to the conclusion that the immediate successor of Samudra Gupta was Rāma Gupta, an elder brother of Candra Gupta II, and the latter came to the throne after murdering him.[1] The theory is based on a few passages of a lost drama *Devī-Candraguptaṃ* by one Viśākha-datta, quoted in the *Nātyadarpaṇa* by Rāmacandra and Guṇa-candra. The story of the drama runs as follows: Rāma Gupta, an impotent and imbecile king, agreed to surrender his queen Dhruvadevī to a Śaka chief who had invaded his kingdom. Rāma Gupta's younger brother Candra Gupta protested against such an act of dishonour and himself guised as queen went to

[74] *JNSI*, v. p 136.

[1] Viśākhadatta, the writer of the *Devī-Candraguptam* has been placed by Levi sometimes between the Gupta dynasty and Harṣa. Stein Konow, Jayaswal and N Das Gupta regard him as a contemporary of Candra Gupta II. cf. *B C. Law Volume*, p 50.

the Śaka king. When the Śaka king was about to embrace the supposed queen, he was killed by Candra Gupta. Candra Gupta then returned to his own country, killed his brother Rāma Gupta, married Dhruvadevī and ascended the throne.

It is really difficult to pronounce the final judgment on the question of the historicity of the account. Viśākhadatta has been identified with Viśākhadeva, the author of *Mudrārākṣasa* and has even been considered by some to be a contemporary of Candra Gupta II,[2] though competent authorities think that he cannot be earlier than the ninth century A.D. The earliest definite evidence bearing on the subject is the statement of the *Harṣacarita* that "Candra Gupta, in the guise of the female, killed the Śaka king possessed of lust for another's wife at the very city of the enemy".[3] Here we should note that Bāṇa says nothing about Rāma Gupta or Dhruvadevī. In the Sanjan plates of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Amoghavarṣa I of 871 A.D it is stated: "The donor in the Kaliyuga, who was of Gupta lineage, having killed his brother, we are told, seized his kingdom and wife".[4] The point to be noted is that in this cryptic account there is no mention of the Śaka king. The Cambay (A.D. 930) and Sangli (A.D. 933) plates of the Rāstrakūta king Govinda IV mention one Sāhasāṅka who killed his elder brother and married his widow.[5]

Those who believe in the Rāma Gupta theory point out that these references coming from different parts of India and belonging to different periods can hardly be set aside as mere products of fancy. Those who are against the theory, on the other hand, point out that in the epigraphs Candra Gupta II is described as *tatparigṛhīta*[6] implying that he was selected by

[2] Jayaswal, *JBORS*, xviii pp 17ff; N. Das Gupta, *IC*, iv p 216. Konow, *JBORS*, xxiii. p. 444; Saraswati, *IA*, lii. pp 181f; Altekar, *JBORS*, xiv pp 223ff; xv. pp 134ff; Mirashi, *IHQ*, x p 48, *IA*, lxii p 201.

[3] *cf HC*. Trans, p 194

[4] *Ep Ind*, xviii, pp 235f

[5] *ib* vii, pp 26f; *IA*, xii, pp 247f.

[6] Mathura Stone Ins of Candra Gupta II (Fleet, no 4), Bihar and Bhitari Stone Pillar inscriptions of Skanda Gupta (Fleet, nos 12 & 13)

his father for the throne, and, therefore the question of Rāma Gupta becoming king after Samudra Gupta cannot arise. Even if it be assumed that Rāma Gupta seized the throne by force, then, in that case, there would have been a civil war before Candra Gupta would have meekly submitted to the act of usurpation, and in case of such an event, certainly Rāma Gupta, who was so weak and imbecile as to surrender his own wife to an invader, would have been defeated. *Secondly*, there is no inscription referring to a Rāma Gupta of the Gupta dynasty. Dr Bhandarkar thinks that the name Rāma Gupta is a misreading in the drama for Kāca Gupta, while Jayaswal has concluded that Kāca and Rāma are two different names of the same king[7] As we have already stated, the Kāca coins bear on them the legend *sarvarajocchettā*, an epithet unthinkable for a weakling Rāma Gupta; even hyperbole has its limits. *Thirdly*, the details of the incident, as given in the *Harsacarita*, the *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* of Rājaśekhara, and the Rastrakūta records differ from one another regarding the place of the incident, the identification of the *"other's wife"* and also the victim of Candra Gupta's stratagem. In fact, the earliest record on the subject is the *Harsacarita* which gives us two facts, that the Śaka king was possessed of lust for another's wife, and that Candra Gupta killed him in the guise of the female. Later on, the following details were added to the story: (a) that this 'other man' was Rāma or Śarma or Sena Gupta, (b) that Dhruvadevī, who is described in the epigraphic records as the wife of Candra Gupta II, was originally the wife of this Rāma Gupta; and, (c) that Candra Gupta killed Rāma Gupta and married his widowed queen.

As we shall see later on, it is really a fact that Candra Gupta II put an end to the rule of the Śaka kings of Ujjayinī. Recently, some copper coins of a king named Rāma Gupta have been found at Vidiśā, Eran and E. Malwa. The Udayagiri Cave inscriptions show that Candra Gupta came to this region with the purpose of conquering this world, or in other words, in order to attack the kingdom of the Śaka ksatrapas. It is not

[7] See f n 2 above

unlikely that this Rāma Gupta with his wife had been subjected to some humiliating condition by the Śaka king of Ujjayinī and the latter was later on killed by Candra Gupta II. A significant fact to be noted in this connection is that none of the Gupta records explicitly mention that Candra Gupta put an end to the rule of the Śaka kings of Ujjayinī, which in fact is known from the evidence of coins only. This silence of the epigraphs, which are eloquent over a minor achievement of a ruler, evidently points to the fact that Candra Gupta's victory was not the outcome of a straight fight.

Prof K. D. Bajpai thinks that Rāma Gupta was 'the elder brother of Candra Gupta II Vikramāditya' (*JNSI*, xxiii, pp. 340ff). Dr Sircar thinks that like Hari Gupta and Indra Gupta, Rāma Gupta was not a member of the Imperial dynasty, and flourished about the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century A D' in the outlying provinces of the Gupta empire (*JIH*, xl p. 535) We have to wait for the final judgment.

CANDRA GUPTA II

The Eran inscription of Samudra Gupta shows that he had many sons[1] and the epithet *tatparigrhita* applied to Candra Gupta II implies according to some scholars, that the latter was selected from among them as the best fitted to succeed him on the throne. The Mathura Pillar inscription of the year 61 states that the record was executed in the fifth regnal year of Candra Gupta II (*vijaya-rājya-samvatsare pañcame*).[2] This gives us the definite date that Candra Gupta II became king in 375 A.D Further, the record has another interest inasmuch as it is the first epigraph dated in the Gupta era. While editing the record, Dr Bhandarkar observed: "The inscription refers itself to the reign of Candra Gupta, son of Samudra Gupta. The titles coupled with each name are worth noting They are *bhattāraka*, *mahārāja* and *rājādhirāja*. The first of these, namely, *bhattāraka* is associated pretty frequently with the names of the

[1] Eran inscription, *ll.* 19-20, *Corpus*, iii p 20
[2] *Select Ins*, pp 269-71

Gupta sovereigns. But the other title which they almost invariably assume is *mahārājādhirāja* instead of what we have in the present record, i.e. *mahārāja rājādhirājā*, an exact replica of *maharaja rajatiraja* which the Kushāṇa kings bore. It is quite natural in Mathura which formed one of the most important districts of the Kushāṇa kingdom and where numbers of Kushāna epigraphs have been unearthed. This is but another indication of Mathura and the surrounding region being wrested from the Kushāṇas *for the first time* by Candra Gupta II".[3] It is really curious how Dr. Bhandarkar came to the above conclusion when we have definite evidence to show that the empire of Samudra Gupta included the territory of the Nāgas who ruled over Mathura and other places. The title may have been inspired by the Kusāṇa example, but the Nāgas and not the Kusāṇas had been ruling over the Mathura region on the eve of the rise of the Guptas.

VĀKĀṬAKAS AND W. KSATRAPAS

We have already seen that the Nāgas offered the stiffest resistance to Samudra Gupta who had also to be in alert against the rising power of the Vākātakas. Candra Gupta II at once perceived the danger looming from these two quarters and he was clever to win over them to his side by matrimonial alliances From the Poona C.P. inscription of Prabhāvatī Guptā, it is clear that she was the daughter of Candra Gupta II by his wife Kuveranāgā, born of the Nāga family (*Nāga-kulasambhūtā*) and was herself the wife of Rudrasena II, the Vākātaka king.[4] Rudrasena II had a very short reign and after his death Prabhāvatī Guptā was appointed the regent of his minor sons Divākarasena and Pravarasena II[5] This led indirectly to the increase of the Gupta influence in the Vākāṭaka court. The Vākātakas held an important strategic position, and a Vākāṭaka king "could be of much service or disservice to the northern in-

[3] *Ep Ind.* xxi p 3
[4] *Select Ins*, pp. 411-5
[5] Appendix ii. *infra.*

-vader of the dominions of the Śaka Satraps of Gujarat and Surāshtra".[6] As Prabhāvatī Guptā, the daughter of Candra Gupta II, was the regent and the *de facto* ruler of the Vākātaka kingdom from c. 390 to c. 410 A D, the Gupta monarch utilised the opportunity to put an end to the rule of his Śaka contemporaries As we have already stated, Candra Gupta II's victory over the Śaka kings is not explicitly mentioned in the Gupta records, though the same can be clearly inferred from the evidence of the coins. The Gupta monarch's campaigns against the western ksatrapas is apparently alluded to in the Udayagiri Cave inscription of Vīrasena Śāba, a native of Pātaliputra, and a *saciva* of the Great Gupta monarch, placed in charge of the Department of Peace and War, who "came here accompanied by the king in person, who was seeking to conquer the whole world".[7] In his campaigns against the Śakas, Candra Gupta evidently made Eastern Malwa the base of his operations. Eastern Malwa (Ākara) must have been conquered by Candra Gupta II as early as 401 A.D, for an epigraphic text on the Udayagiri hill bearing date G E. 82 = 401 A.D. records a dedication made by feudatory mahārāja Sanakānīka during the reign of Candra Gupta II[8]

The conquest of the western ksatrapas by Candra Gupta II is proved by his rare silver coins which are more or less direct imitations of those of the latest western ksatrapas As Rapson states, "Like their proto-types, the coins of the latest mahākṣatrapas, which they closely resemble in style and fabric, they have on the *Obv.* the date accompanied by some equivalent of the word *varse*, behind the king's head, and retain some traces of the old inscr. in Greek characters, while on the *Rev* they substitute the Gupta type (a peacock) for the Caitya, with crescent and star".[9] The latest date of the coins of the western ksatrapas is 310 or 31 x (Śaka) = 388 + x A.D., while the earliest date on the silver coins of the Gupta monarch struck in imitation of the former, is G E 90 or 90 x = A D 409 + x Thus it

[6] Smith, *JRAS*, 1914, p 324
[7] *Corpus*, iii p 36
[8] *ib* p. 25
[9] Rapson, *Catalogue*, p cli

was during this interval that the Gupta conquest of Surāstra and Gujrat took place. It is possible to limit the period further, for the Udayagiri inscription of the year 401 A D shows the occupation of Eastern Malwa by the Guptas and it is improbable that the western kṣatrapas were able to resist for long the victorious progress of Candra Gupta II [10]

OTHER CONQUESTS

In this connection, we propose to discuss the evidences contained in the famous Meharauli Iron Pillar inscription of king Candra, about whose identification there is much controversy.[11] It is a posthumous record and describes the conquests of Candra "on whose arm fame was inscribed by the sword, when, in battle in the Vaṅga countries, he kneaded (and turned) back with (his) breast the enemies who, uniting together, came against (him); —he, by whom, having crossed in warfare the seven mouths of the (river) Sindhu, the Bāhlīkas were conquered" . Apart from the facts that palaeographically the record is to be assigned to the Gupta period, that Candra Gupta also takes the name of Candra on his copper coins, that like Candra of the record Candra Gupta II was also a Vaisṇava, and, that Delhi, where the record has been found, formed a part of the Gupta empire,[12] the Meharauli record seems to throw indirect light on the conquest of the Śaka kṣatrapas by Candra Gupta II. As we have already seen, Rudradāman conquered the Lower Indus valley and there is no proof that any of the later Kuṣāṇa kings was in a position to snatch it away from the hands of the Śakas. There is, therefore, every likelihood that it continued to remain under the rule of the Śaka satraps and as Candra Gupta conquered the Śaka dominion, he naturally crossed the seven mouths of the river Indus. In this period the term Bāhlīka, which originally denoted Bactria,

[10] *SI*, p. 78

[11] He has been identified with Candra Gupta Maurya (*Seth*), Kaniska (*Majumdar*), Candrānaśa, the Nāga king (*Raychaudhuri*), Candra Gupta I (*Basak*) etc

[12] *Select Ins*, p 275, f n. 2

came to be used as a synonym for Bāhīka, or the Land of the Five Rivers[13] Candra Gupta evidently went from the Lower Indus valley to the Punjab.[14]

The epigraph further states that Candra fought against a confederacy of powers in the Vaṅga country The term Vanga denoted according to Kālidāsa, who belonged to the Gupta age, the region lying between the two streams of the Ganges i e. the Bhāgirathī, and the Padmā[15] The Allahabad record makes Samatata, which comprised a portion of this Vaṅga, a pratyanta state owing allegiance to Samudra Gupta Evidently, some of these pratyanta rulers refused to acknowledge Candra Gupta II, who, however, brought them under subjugation. The conquest of Vaṅga possibly occurred at the close of the career of the monarch and hence we have no other record, epigraphic or numismatic, of his age to throw light on the subject. It is thus apparent that Candra Gupta II had under him one of the greatest empires of North India in the days after the Mauryas, an empire which was greater than the empires of Harsa Bhoja or Mahendrapāladeva. Through his daughter Prabhāvatī Guptā his influence also reigned supreme in the Mahārāstra region The commentator of the Prākrit kāvya *Setubandha* informs us that Pravarasena II, the Vākātaka prince and grandson of the Gupta monarch, lived in the latter's court and once composed a poem which was later on corrected by the great poet Kālidāsa.[16] The historicity of this statement cannot be vouchsafed inasmuch as the date of the poet still remains undetermined This much, however, appears to be clear that Kālidāsa was later than or a later contemporary of Bhāsa whom he mentions as one of the *pūrvasūris* in his *Mālavikāgnimitram*[17] The *Bharatavākya* at the end of the dramas of Bhāsa refers to one Rājasimha whose kingdom was bounded by the

[13] Ptolemy, p 395.

[14] Dr Altekar thinks that Candra Gupta II attacked the Kidāra Kusānas, *VGA*, p 21.

[15] *Raghuvamśam*, iv 36 The expression "*Gangā-srotāntaresu ca*" evidently refers to the Padmā and the Gaṅgā.

[16] *VGA*, pp 114, 373; *cf* *H C.* Trans, p 3

[17] *Mālavikāgnimitram*, I. v ; *var* Dhāvaka.

seas and the Himalayan and the Vindhyan Ranges. Keith has shown that Bhāsa must be later than Aśvaghosa,[18] and so the king whose dominion tallies with the above description, appears to have been Candra Gupta II, who also adopts the title of Narendrasiṃha (= Rājasimha) on his coins. Bhāsa thus may have been an early contemporary of Candra Gupta II. In that case, Kālidāsa may be regarded as living either in the later years of Candra Gupta II, or early years of Kumāra Gupta I. In any case, he cannot be dragged down beyond the time of Kumāra Gupta, for the Hūṇas are represented in the *Raghuvamśam* as living in the Oxus valley,[19] while as we shall see later on, during the time of Skanda Gupta, the successor of Kumāra Gupta I, they penetrated into the interior of India. Thus there is no difficulty in assuming that Kālidāsa lived in the later days of Candra Gupta II The Vākātaka prince Pravarasena also must have composed the poem in the later days of the Gupta monarch, for he was the latter's grandson. In this connection, we may note further that in his *Śrṅgāraprakāśa,* Bhoja has quoted a verse written by Kālidāsa who is said to have reported to the Gupta monarch Vikramāditya on the luxurious life at the court of the lord of Kuntala, who has been identified with Pravarasena II[20] Mirashi points out that the Pattan plates of Pravarasena II of the year 27 refer to a Kālidāsa as the writer of the charter.[21] While we admit that these are not absolutely conclusive evidences proving the contemporaneity of Candra Gupta II and Kālidāsa, it cannot at the same time be lightly brushed aside at once. These traditions have the indirect value of proving Candra Gupta II's influence at the Vākātaka court

RELATIONS WITH THE KADAMBAS

The Talagunda inscription[22] of Śāntivarman states that the

[18] Keith, *HSL*, p xii.
[19] *Raghuvamśam*, iv 67.
[20] *Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference,* as quoted in *PHAI*, p 564, f n 2
[21] *Ep Ind*, xxiii. pp 81ff
[22] *Ep Ind*, viii, p 31ff

Kadamba king Kākusthavarman gave his daughters in marriage to the royal families of the Guptas and others. J-Dubreuil thinks that Vākātaka Narendrasena, son of Pravarasena II and great grandson of Candra Gupta II, became the son-in-law of Kākusthavarman and that the Talagunda record refers to this indirect relation of the Kadambas with the Guptas[23] Dr D C Sircar thinks that it is also possible that while a daughter of Kākustha was married to Vākāṭaka Narendrasena, another daughter "was actually given in marriage to a Gupta prince of Pātaliputra, who was possibly a son or grandson of Candra Gupta II or Kumāra Gupta I".[24] It may be noted in this connection that some mediaeval chiefs of Kuntala also trace their lineage to Candra Gupta.[25]

PĀTALIPUTRA & OTHER CITIES

It is generally believed that Pātaliputra continued to be the capital of the empire, and after the defeat of the Śaka kṣatrapas a second capital was founded at Ujjayinī. The chiefs of the Kuntala country, who claimed descent from Candra Gupta II Vikramāditya, refer to him as *Ujjayinī-puravarādhīśvara* and also as *Pātalipuravarādhīśvara*. In the traditional Vikramāditya stories also the king is described as belonging to both Pātaliputra and Ujjayinī Fa-hsien in his account states that: "Pātaliputra is the largest city in the whole Middle Kingdom. The people are rich and prosperous and vie with each other in performing good deeds Every year in celebration of the eighth day of the second month they hold an image procession. They use a four-wheeled cart on which five tiers are constructed in bamboo, with a halberd-shaped central post about twenty feet high, the whole structure resembling a pagoda. This is covered with white woollen cloth, printed with various devas in colour, adorned with gold, silver and glass, and hung with silk pennants and canopies. There are four shrines on the four sides, each

[23] *AHD*, p 100
[24] *Suc Sat*, p 256
[25] *PHAI*, p 556

containing a seated Buddha, attended by standing Bodhisattvas. About twenty such carts are prepared, each decked out in a different way. . The elders and laymen of this country have established charitable hospitals in the city, to which all the poor, homeless, deformed and ill can go. Here all their wants are supplied, and the physicians who attend them prescribe the food and medicine they require. When cured, they are free to leave."[26] The description shows that the tradition of the Great Aśoka had been continuing even in the days of the Vikramāditya.

Unfortunately for us we have no such authentic account of the second capital, Ujjayinī. Kālidāsa, in his *Meghadūtam*, incidentally refers to the palaces of the place proving indirectly that it was a very flourishing city.[27] In this connection, we have to consider critically the fact whether another metropolis was Ayodhyā. The biographer of Vasubandhu refers to the city as the capital of the Vikramāditya,[28] though of course it is not certain which Vikramāditya he means. Allan points out that the copper coins issued by Candra Gupta II are generally found in and around Ayodhyā[29] This may prove that Ayodhyā was also a metropolis and a mint city.

From the evidence of the coins we learn that Candra Gupta took the title of Vikramāditya. Some scholars think that the story of *Śakāri* Vikramāditya, as found in the Jaina *Kālakācāryakathānaka*[29a] is in reality a legend of the Vikrama cycle, the original hero of which is Vikramāditya Candra Gupta II

[26] A Record of the Buddhist countries by Fa-hsien, Peking 1957, pp 60-61.

[27] *Meghadūṭam*, I 28

[28] Takakusu thinks that Vasubandhu lived from about 420 to 500 A D (*JRAS*, 1905, pp. 43ff). This would make Vasubandhu a contemporary of the descendants of Candra Gupta II But if we agee with M. Peri that the Buddhist scholar lived in the fourth century A.D. (*BEFEO*, xi, pp 339f), then his contemporaneity with Candra Gupta II may not be ruled out *cf Indian Studies in Honour of C. R. Lanman*, pp. 79ff If, however, the Bālāditya of the account be identified with Narasiṃhagupta Bālāditya then it is certainly better to agree with Takakusu.

[29] Allan, *Catalogue*, p., cxxxi.

[29a] *supra*, p 70

and as the latter also lived in the Mālava country, the era of the Mālavas starting from 58 B.C. came to be associated with his name. Vikramāditya's driving away of the Śakas from Ujjayinī, it is asserted, is nothing but the echo of the defeat of the Śaka ksatrapas by Candra Gupta II. It is difficult to pronounce any judgment on the problem.

ADMINISTRATION

The excavations carried out at Basarh by Bloch has unearthed numerous clay seals with the inscriptions throwing light on the history of the place during the time of Candra Gupta II.[30] One of the seals bears the epigraph 'Mahādevī Dhruvasvāminī, queen of Mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta II, and mother of Mahārāja Govinda Gupta'. Evidently Govinda Gupta was his father's governor in the province of Tira or Tirabhukti during the time of his father Candra Gupta II. This reminds us of the Maurya practice of appointing princes of the royal blood as the governors of the provinces. The seals mention the designations of a large number of offices and officers, evidently connected with the provincial administration Dr. R. K. Mookerjee has prepared the following list from the epigraphs on the seals[31] :

1. *Uparika*, Governor of the Province, as in *Tirabhukti-uparika-adhikaraṇa*.
2. *Kumārāmātyādhikaraṇa*, office of the Princes' Ministers. The officer *Kumārāmātya* is given the curious title of *Yuvarāja* or *Bhaṭṭāraka* signifying the chief of the Princes' Ministers.
3. *Balādhikaraṇa*, office of the Head of the Army, who also bears the title of *Yuvarāja* and *Bhattāraka*.
4. *Raṇabhāṇḍādhikaraṇa*, the Military Exchequer.
5. *Daṇḍapāśādhikaraṇa*, office of the Chief of the Police.
6. *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, Chief Justice.
7 *Vinayasthiti-sthāpaka*, Officer or Minister in charge of Law and Order.

[30] For Basarh excavation by Bloch, see *ASIR*, 1930-4, pp 107f
[31] Mookerjee, *The Gupta Empire*, p 50

8. *Bhaṭāśvapati,* Head of the Infantry and Cavalry.
9. *Mahāpratihāra,* Chief Chamberlain.
10. *Vinayaśūra,* Chief Censor.
11. *Talavara,* ...... (?)

If we analyse the above account we can come to the conclusion that in the matter of provincial administration Candra Gupta II followed a model which was a mixture of Mauryan and Scythian ideals. Thus the Prince-viceroyship was undoubtedly a continuation of the Mauryan system. But the fact that a yuvarāja was the chief minister or the head of the army while mahārāja was the governor shows the influence of the Scythian ideal in which a ruler or *mahākṣatrapa* was associated with a *kṣatrapa* usually the former's eldest son.[32]

The seals also throw some light on the district and the local administrations of the province. Thus one of the seals bears the epigraph *Vaiśāli-adhiṣṭhāna-adhikaraṇa,* showing that it belonged to the office of the District Officer of Vaiśāli. Another seal refers to the *Pariṣā* or the Municipal Committee of the city of *Udānakūpa.*

While it may be presumed that similar system of administration prevailed in other provinces of the empire, some regions were under the rule of feudatory princes, who held offices evidently by hereditary rights. Thus the Udayagiri Cave inscriptions of 401 A.D. refer to three generations of feudatory rulers,—mahārāja Chagalaga, his son mahārāja Visṇudāsa, his son mahārāja Sanakānika.[33] A Gaya inscription of the year 64 = 383 A D refers to another feudatory mahārāja Trikamala[34] Others of the same rank were Svāmidāsa ruler of Valkha, probably situated somewhere in Central India mentioned in an inscription of the year 67 = 386 A.D.,[35] and mahārāja Śrī Viśvāmitra Svāmī mentioned in a Besnagar seal.[36]

[32] *PHAI,* p 519.

[33] *Corpus,* iii p 25.

[34] *ASIR,* 1922-3, p 169 The date of Trikamala is uncertain Some scholars refer the year 64 to the Śaka era and conclude that Trikamala ruled in the middle of the second century A D

[35] *Ep Ind* xv p 289; *cf ABORI,* xxv p 159

[36] *ASIR,* 1914-5, p 81.

The last-known date of Candra Gupta II is the year 93 = 412—13 A.D. mentioned in a Sanchi record. As the Bilsad inscription of the year 96 = 415 A.D. shows Kumāra Gupta I as the mahārājādhirāja,[37] it may be presumed that the reign of Candra Gupta II came to an end sometime between 412 and 415 A.D.

KUMĀRA GUPTA I

After the death of Candra Gupta II his son Kumāra Gupta I, born of queen Druvadevī or Dhruvasvāminī, became the mahārājādhirāja of the Gupta empire We have got a large number of epigraphic records, no less than thirteen, belonging to his reign, but as they do not speak of any political event it may be presumed that his reign was on the whole a peaceful one, though from the Bhitari inscription of his son Skanda Gupta we can infer that there was some crisis in the last days of his life.[1] As already stated, the earliest date of his reign, A.D. 415, is known from his Bilsad inscription, while his silver coins give his last date, A.D. 455.[2] Thus he had a long reign of at least 40 years. He evidently maintained intact the vast empire that he inherited from his father. His coins in large numbers have been found at Satara, in Bombay, Ahmadabad and Bhaunagar in Western India Whether these finds indicate that his sway extended over South-Western Deccan must remain uncertain till the discovery of further record from the region, for coins often are carried from one place to another and so their provenance is no sure index of political hegemony of their issuer.

VICEROYS

It is during the reign of Kumāra Gupta I that we find for the first time Gupta inscriptions in Bengal. Two of these come from Damodarpur (in the Dinajpur district), one from Dhanaidaha (in the Rajsahi district), while the fourth from Baigram, which is situated near Hili in North Bengal The Baigram

[37] *Corpus*, iii. pp. 431.

[1] *ib*, pp. 53f.

[2] *EHI*, p. 345-6.

record does not mention the name of any ruler, but its date, the year 128 = 447 A.D., shows that it falls within the reign period of Kumāra Gupta. The Damodarpur records bear the dates G E. 124 and 128 while the one from Dhanaidaha the year 113. They all bear the name of the mahārājādhirāja Kumāra Gupta. Like other Gupta records from North Bengal they are also connected with the matter of land transaction.[3] It is, however, curious that there is no record of the monarch from other parts of the Vaṅga country, which had been incorporated into the Gupta empire during the last days of Candra Gupta II. As Dr. B. C. Sen thinks it is not unlikely that the administrative limits of Puṇḍravardhana, which originally signified North Bengal, "in those days may not have necessarily coincided with but in fact exceeded the geographical". Kumāra Gupta's viceroy in charge of the Puṇḍravardhana-*bhūkti* was Cirātadatta, who held "his office at least for a term of five years (G E 124-28), as his name is to be found in both the dated inscriptions from Damodarpur, mentioned above"[4] The appointment of Cirātadatta in such a high post was indeed a departure from the practice prevalent during the time of Candra Gupta II, inasmuch as Cirātadatta was certainly not a prince of the royal blood. On the western part of the empire, however, Ghaṭotkaca Gupta, possibly a son of the emperor, was appointed a viceroy in Eastern Malwa with jurisdiction over Tumbavana, modern Tumain, about 50 miles to the north-west of Eran.[5]

GOVINDA GUPTA

The position of Western Malwa was peculiar. The Mandasor inscription of Kumāra Gupta I and Bandhuvarman refers to Kumāra Gupta as ruling the earth (*Kumāra-Gupte pṛthivīm praśāsati*) and Bandhuvarman as ruling at Daśapura evidently as a feudatory under the former.[6] The record, however, bears the date Mālava year 493 = A.D. 435. The absence of any re-

[3] *SHAIB*, pp 210f, *Ep Ind* xv pp 113f
[4] *SHAIB*, p 212
[5] *IA*, xlix, (1920), pp 114-5
[6] *Select Ins*, pp 288ff

ference to the Gupta era is indeed significant. It shows that though Kumāra Gupta I was recognised as the nominal overlord, Bandhuvarman, the ruler of Daśapura was practically independent so far as the internal affairs of the territory was concerned. In this connection, we may note the evidence of another Mandasor record of the Mālava year 524. The record is a posthumous one and mentions one Govinda Gupta, and Indra is represented as being suspicious of Govinda's power.[7] Govinda Gupta is evidently identical with mahārāja Govinda Gupta known from the Vaiśālī seal as the son of mahārājādhirāja Candra Gupta II and the queen Dhruvasvāminī. Dr. Bhandarkar thinks that as in this record 'Indra is represented as being suspicious of Govinda Gupta's power the latter seems to have been the supreme ruler'.[8] If we accept the view then we have to infer that Govinda Gupta, brother of Kumāra Gupta I, revolted and became independent in the Mandasor region. Some scholars find in Indra an indirect reference to Kumāra Gupta I, on account of the latters' title of *Śrī Mahendra* and *Mahendrakarmā* on the coins.[9] As the Mandasor record of 436 A.D., referred to before, describes Kumāra Gupta I as ruling the earth, it may be presumed that this revolt possibly occurred after this date. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that in the second part of the above Mandasor record, which bears the date M.E. 529 = 473 A.D., there is no reference to any Gupta king. Possibly, after this revolt Mandasor region became an independent unit, though it had already been autonomous in internal matters, as shown by the use of the dates in Mandasor records in the Mālava era, and not in the Gupta era.

CONQUESTS

The coins prove that Kumāra Gupta I performed an Aśvamedha sacrifice. Whether it was the outcome of any new conquests by the king is, however, uncertain. We may consider in this connection two different kinds of coins issued by him.

[7] *ASIR*, 1922-23, p 187.
[8] *Ep.* Ind. xix, App. no. 7, p. 2, fn. 5.
[9] *CGD*, pp 61ff.

On one group there is on the *Obv.* the legend *Śrīmān Vyāghrabalaparākramah* and on the *Rev.* *Kumāragupto'dhirāja*, while on the other group there is the figure of Kārtikeya on the *Rev* and on the *Obv.* the legend *Jayati Svabhūmau guṇarāśi* etc. Kumāra or Kārtikeya is the god of war and he was generally worshipped by the kings when they had to meet any enemy or to make any new conquests.[10] The legend *Vyāghrabalaparākramah* may have some connection with his conquests in the tiger infested Narmada valley.[11] Such an inference by itself may appear to be rather a fanciful one, but when we find that he issued coins resembling the Traikuṭaka coinage we may possibly infer that he really made some conquests in that region.

Kumāra Gupta was thus undoubtedly the worthy successor of his great father. He was also known by other names such as, *Śrī Mahendra, Ajita Mahendra, Siṃha Mahendra, Aśvamedha Mahendra, Mahendrakarmā, Mahendrakalpa, Śrī Mahendra Siṃha, Mahendra Kumāra etc.*

PUṢYAMITRAS

Kumāra Gupta's adventure in the Narmada valley brought a great crisis in the last years of his reign. The Bhitari inscription of his son Skanda Gupta states that the Pusyamitras[12] who *'had great resources in men and money'* attacked the kingdom, and Skanda Gupta had to fight hard with them *'to restore the fallen fortunes of his family'* and had to pass a whole night on bare earth. Ultimately, Skanda Gupta became victorious but Kumāra Gupta died before he could get news of this victory. It is difficult to determine exactly who these Pusyamitras were. The *Purāṇas* associate the Puṣyamitras with the Mekala country near the source of the Narmada. The Balaghat Plates of the Vākātaka king Prthivīsena II states that his father Narendrasena's sway extended over Kośala, Mekala and Mālava. The date of Narendrasena is not yet definitely fixed, but as he is assigned to the period c. 440 to c. 460 A.D., it has been assumed

[10] *DHI*, p 362f.
[11] *PHAI*, pp. 569f
[12] Divekar reads *'yudhy-amitrāmś = ca'* (*ABORI*, I, pp. 99ff)

that he was the leader of the Puṣyamitra tribe.[13] But this view seems to be improbable because Narendrasena himself had been in a tottering state about this time (c. 455 A.D.) due to the invasion of the Nala king Bhavadattavarman.[14] Whatever the identification of the Puṣyamitras may be, this much appears to be certain that they came from the Mekala region. In stanzas *2 & 3* of the Junagadh inscription of Skanda Gupta,[15] which may be assigned to c. 455 A.D. we find the following description:

> "And next, victorious for ever is the supreme king of kings over kings, whose breast is embraced by the goddess of wealth and splendour, who has developed heroism by (the strength of his) arms, and who plucked (and utilised) the authority of (his local) representatives, who were so many Garudas, (and used it as) an antidote against the (hostile) kings, who were so many serpents, lifting up their hoods in pride and arrogance; —Skanda Gupta, of great glory, the abode of kingly qualities, who, when (his) father by his own power had attained the position of being a friend of the gods (i.e., had died), bowed down his enemies, and made subject to himself the (whole) earth, bounded by the waters of the four oceans, (and) full of thriving countries round the borders of it. .. ...".

The above account clearly shows that just before the death of his father Skanda Gupta fought against the hostile kings, *"who were so many serpents"*. Here evidently we have a reference to his fight against the Pusyamitras Fleet in a note says that "there is possibly a secondary allusion to Skanda Gupta having overthrown some kings of the well-known Nāga or serpent lineage".[16] Indeed, from this description we can clearly make the inference that the Pusyamitras were a tribe of the Nāga stock. That the Nāgas had been an important political factor in the jungles of the Vindhya as far as Broach is proved by the Kaira grant of Dadda III, which states that Dadda I

[13] *VGA*, p. 106.
[14] *VGA*, p 107; *Ep. Ind.* xix, p. 102
[15] *Corpus*, iii, p 59.
[16] *Corpus*, iii, p. 62, fn. 2

uprooted the Nāgas who have been identified with the jungle tribes ruled over by Nirihullaka of Broach.[17] From the Rajim grant it appears that in 800 A.D. mahārāja Tivaradeva of Śrīpura in Dakṣiṇa-Kośala most probably defeated a Nāga tribe[18] From these evidences it appears that the Nāga tribe inhabited the region of the Vindhyas extending from Kośala to Broach, and if we consider this fact in the background of the above description given in the Junagadh record we may possibly conclude that the Puṣyamitras were a branch of the Nāga race.

Skanda Gupta was able to annihilate completely the power of this invading barbarian horde and restore the fallen fortune of the family. Before, however, the news of this victory reached the capital the old king Kumāra Gupta was dead.

SKANDA GUPTA

From the evidence of the inscriptions and coins we learn that Kumāra Gupta was succeeded by Skanda Gupta about 455 A.D. and the latter must have ruled at least for twelve years upto 467 A D. The Bhitari inscription has given in a condensed form almost all the principal events of his life, evidently in a chronological order. For the sake of convenience, we may briefly note them here before proceeding with the detailed discussions .

(a) "....and then, having conquered the Pusyamitras, who had developed great power and wealth, he placed (his) left foot on a foot-stool which was the king (of that tribe himself);

(b) "Who, when (his) father had attained the skies, conquered his enemies by the strength of (his arm) .. . and then, crying 'the victory has been achieved', betook himself to (his) mother, whose eyes were full of tears from joy, just as Krishṇa, when he had slain (his) enemies, betook himself to (his mother) Devakī;

(c) "Who with his own armies, established (again) (his) lineage that had been made to totter ..., (and)

[17] *Ind. Ant* xiii, pp 82ff
[18] *Corpus*, iii, p 295

with his two arms subjugated the earth, (and) shewed mercy to the conquered peoples in this place ....

(d) "By whose two arms the earth was shaken, when he, the creator (of a disturbance like that) of a terrible whirlpool, joined in close conflict with the Hūnas ...."

We may now compare the above account of the Bhitari record with that given in the Junagadh inscription :

(a) *Stanza* 2, discussed above, gives an account of his fight against the hostile kings "who were so many serpents", i.e., the struggle with Pusyamitras;

(b) *Stanza* 3, discussed above, speaks of Kumāra Gupta's death;

(c) *Stanza* 4 states that his "fame was sung even in the countries of the *Mlecchas* having their pride broken to the very root",

(d) *Stanza* 5 states that "Lakshmī of her own accord selected (him) as her husband having discarded all the other sons of kings".

A comparative study of the above two accounts gives us the following facts : (a) Before his father's death, Skanda Gupta conquered the Pusyamitras, who were possibly of Nāga origin ; (b) immediately after his father's death, Skanda Gupta fought again with some enemies, and so the Mlecchas are not the Hūnas, as Allan thinks,[1] for the Hūnas are referred to later on in the Bhitari record ; (c) Skanda Gupta became king but did not destroy his rivals (*cf. "shewed mercy to the conquered peoples"* in the Bhitari record) ; (d) he fought with the Hūnas at a later date.

FIGHT WITH THE MLECCHAS

We have already referred to Skanda Gupta's fight with the Pusyamitras in which he became victorious. It is, however, not certain who were the Mlecchas with whom he had to fight immediately after his father's death. The statement of the Junagadh record that he "deliberated for days and nights before

[1] Allan, *CGD*, p xlvi

making up his mind who could be trusted with the important task of guarding the lands of the Saurāṣṭras" and then appointed Parṇadatta as the governor of the land evidently points to the fact that the fight with the enemies occurred here or somewhere near by. In the *Raghuvaṃśam* of Kālidāsa we find how the Yavanas fought against Raghu in the *Pārasikadeśa*.[2] As the term Yavana denoted both the Greeks and the Persians in the later period,[3] it is not unlikely that some such mixed horde possibly invaded the Gupta dominion immediately after Kumāra Gupta's death and Skanda Gupta was able to drive them outside the boundaries of his dominion.

FRATRICIDAL STRUGGLE

There has been some controversy whether there was any fratricidal struggle at the time of Skanda Gupta's accession.[4] Though the Junagadh record states that he was selected by the goddess of fortune from among other royal princes,[5] it has been held that it cannot at once point to a war of succession. But when we find that in the Bhitari record he is credited with having shown mercy to the conquered people and that the Bhitari and the Nalanda seals[6] state that Puru Gupta was the immediate successor of Kumāra Gupta, we may possibly conclude that there was some trouble over the succession of Skanda Gupta Those who support the fratricidal struggle theory further point out that as the name of Skanda Gupta's mother is not mentioned in the epigraphs, she was evidently not the chief queen of Kumāra Gupta and hence Skanda Gupta was not the rightful claimant to the throne. Though other interpretations are also possible, the argument, it must be admitted, has got some force.

[2] Raghuvamśam, iv. 60-72.

[3] Dr Modi Volume, pp 282ff.

[4] *PHAI*, pp 572ff; *VGA*, pp 162; *JASB*, NS, xvii, pp 253ff.

[5] "*Vyapetya sarvān manujendra-putrān Lakṣmīh svayaṁ yaṃ varayaṁ cakāra*". (v. 5)

[6] *Select Ins* p 313 & 321; *MASI*, no. 66, 64; *Ep. Ind.* xxvi, p 235; *IHQ*, xix, p 119.

FIGHT WITH THE EPTHALITES

The greatest achievement of Skanda Gupta lies in the fact that he checked the infiltration of the White Huns, or the Epthalites into India. The history of the Epthalites in India will be dealt with later on. Here, it may be stated only that they were not a branch of the Hiung-nus or the Huns proper as it has been supposed by several scholars,[7] but belonged to the vast Scythian horde of Central Asia. A branch of them evidently entered into India during the later years of Skanda Gupta, who completely crushed them in such a way that till c. 500 A D. they could not cross the natural frontiers of India As Dr. R. C Majumdar has stated "If we remember that the cruel devastations of the Huns had spread from the Danube to the Indus, that their leader Attila, who died in 453 A.D., was 'able to send equal defiance to the courts of Revenna and Constantinople', and that thirty years later they overwhelmed Persia and killed its king, we can well realise the value of the great victory of Skanda Gupta over them All over the vast empire the people must have heaved a sigh of relief at the great deliverance. This heroic achievement that saved his kingdom from the scourge of a cruel barbaric invasion justified the assumption of the title of Vikramāditya by Skanda Gupta which we find on his coins along with Kramāditya"[8]

There is absolutely no evidence to show that the Gupta empire suffered any diminution during the time of Skanda Gupta. The Bhitari inscription which must have been incised during the later years of his reign, as shown by the mention of the Hūṇas in it, describes Skanda Gupta as having conquered the earth (*avanīm vijītya*) which is on a par with the description of Kumāra Gupta I in the Mandasor inscriptions, referred to above. His *Bull type* of coins prove his authority over the Cambay coast while his *Altar type* shows his hold over Cutch.

[7] *Select Ins* p 315, fn 1, *VGA*, pp 177ff
[8] *VGA*, p 164

ADMINISTRATION

Skanda Gupta was evidently able to withstand so many severe shocks because he had under him a batch of able and trustworthy officers. Parṇadatta was the governor of the Surāstra region, while Śarvanāga was in charge of the Antarvedī country,[9] and mahārāja Bhīmavarman mentioned in a Stone Image inscription from Kośam of 458 A.D. may have been a feudatory under him.

From the inscriptions of Skanda Gupta we get some idea about the local administration of the age. The Bihar Stone inscription refers to officers like *Agrahārika, Śaulkika* (officers in charge of collections of toll or customs), *Gaulmika* (officer in charge of forest)[10] etc. The Junagadh inscription gives us an insight into the duties and responsibilities of the *Nagararaksaka* or the mayor of the city. Parṇadatta's son was one such *Nagararaksaka* in the city of Girinagara (Girnar), the capital of the Surāstra-visaya The epigraph gives a description of the qualities of his head and heart and states in detail how, when due to too much rainfall, the dam of the lake Sudarśana bursted and the lives of the people were in danger, Cakrapālita, with his father Parṇadatta, saved the country by raising an embankment by an unlimited expenditure of wealth within a short period of two months. The people heaved a sigh of relief and the poet, who composed the record, gives in glowing terms high tributes both to the father and the son.

IV

The Imperial Crisis and the Foreign Invasion

THE SUCCESSORS OF SKANDA GUPTA

It is generally believed that Skanda Gupta whose last known date is 467 A.D. was succeeded by Puru Gupta, the son of Kumāra

[9] The term Antarvedī denotes the region lying between the Ganges and the Jumna.

[10] *Select Ins.* p 316

Gupta I by the chief queen Ananta Devī.[1] The order of succession after Puru Gupta is somewhat confusing. Before the discovery of the Nalanda seals of Budha Gupta and Viṣṇu Gupta, scholars generally depended on the Chinese accounts, as preserved in the *Si-yu-ki* and the *Life*, and the Bhitari seal for determining this order.[2]

In the *Si-yu-ki* and the *Life*, we have got an account of the patrons of the Nalanda Vihāra. The patrons are as follows: Śakrāditya, Buddha Gupta rāja, Tathāgata rāja, Bālāditya and Vajra. There is another account of the patrons in the *She-kia-fang-che* written by Tao-si-yan, a disciple of Yuan-Chwang, better known than Hui-li, who wrote the *Life* of the Master. The account of the *She-kia-fang-che* runs as follows:

> "In earlier and later times five kings joined together and built it. The first was Śakrāditya, . . . he started building his monastery. The second king was Buddha Gupta ..... the third was Tathāgata Gupta .... the fourth was Bālāditya ..... the fifth was Vajra".

The author of the *She-kia-fang-che* had taken it down as he had heard it from Yuan Chwang. So also Hui-li. The *Si-yu-ki* was not probably all written by Yuan Chwang, but compiled by some of his assistants from his notes. Under these circumstances, it appears that the Chinese account of the Gupta kings only speaks of the donors of the Nalanda Vihāra, and obviously those members of the dynasty who made no contributions have been left out So we can only take the list as showing the relative position of the donors as coming one after another, and cannot draw any inference regarding the relationship among them

The Bhitari and the Nalanda seals, on the other hand, present us with the following genealogy of the Later Imperial Gupta kings:

[1] This was first suggested by Pannalal, *Hindusthan Review*, 1918, Jan; *JBORS*, 1918, pp 412-7

[2] *PHAI*, pp 494-505

Kumāra Gupta I = Ananta Devī

Puru Gupta = Candrā Devī

Budha Gupta

Narasimha Gupta = Mirā Devī

Kumāra Gupta

Viṣṇu Gupta

In the epigraphic records, we have references to three more Gupta rulers—(a) Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath inscription[3] of the year 154; (b) Vainya Gupta of the Gunaighar inscription[4] of the year 188, and of the Nalanda seal; (c) Bhānu Gupta of the Eran Stone Pillar[5] inscription of the year 191.

It is really a difficult problem to place the above three rulers in the genealogical table of the Guptas. At the outset we must note the fact that Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath record does not adopt even the title of mahārāja, and his description '...*bhūmim rakṣati Kumāragupte*....' evidently shows that he was not a sovereign, but simply a *goptā,* although he may have belonged to the Imperial family. It may, of course, be argued that in the Sarnath inscription of the year 157, Budha Gupta also does not take the title of mahārājādhirāja or mahārāja, but his description '....*śate samānām pṛthivīṃ Budhagupte praśāsati*[6]....' is conclusive on the status of the ruler. If we accept this view, then it may be inferred that after the death of Skanda Gupta, Puru Gupta became the mahārājādhirāja and was succeeded about 476 A.D. by his son Budha Gupta.

Similarly, in the Eran inscription of the year 191, Bhānu Gupta takes the title of rājā, which shows that he was a mere local governor, belonging to the Imperial dynasty. As regards Vainya Gupta, we may note the fact that in the Gunaighar record he takes the title of mahārāja, while in the Nalanda seal

[3] *Select Ins* pp 320-1; *ASIR,* 1914-5, p. 124
[4] *Select Ins* p 331; *IHQ,* vi pp 53ff, 561ff
[5] *Corpus,* iii. pp 92ff
[6] *Select* Ins. p 323

he is represented as the mahārājādhirāja.[7] His single inscription hails from the district of Comilla which has produced no other Gupta record. This seems to show that at first he was a local governor in the Vaṅga-Samataṭa region, and later on succeeded to the Imperial throne Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out that in the fragmentary seal of Vainya Gupta there is some remnant of mātrā *'U'* at the place of his father's name, a fact which shows that the name of Vainya Gupta's father was *'Ukārānta'* and he restores it as Puru Gupta[8] If we follow this view then Vainya Gupta may be regarded as the brother and immediate successor of Budha Gupta. Narasimha Gupta, another and possibly the youngest brother of Budha Gupta, ruled sometime after 510 A.D., as we shall see later on.

Most scholars think, however, that Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath inscription was an Imperial ruler. Some again hold that he is identical with Kumāra Gupta, son of Narasimha Gupta, and thus Puru Gupta, Narasimha Gupta and Kumāra Gupta II are represented as ruling one after another between c. 467 A D, the last-known date of Skanda Gupta, and c 476 A.D., the initial year of Budha Gupta[9]. The main difficulty in accepting this view is that, *first,* we have to accommodate three kings within a comparatively short period of nine years; and *secondly,* Narasiṃha Gupta is the only Imperial Gupta king who takes the title of *Bālāditya,* while from Yuan Chwang's account it is clear that Bālāditya defeated Mihirakula, the Hūṇa tyrant, who, as we shall see later on, ruler in the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. If we place Narasimha Gupta before c. 473 A D., then we have to find out another Bālāditya, different from Narasimha Gupta, to be a contemporary of Mihirakula. But the existence of a second Bālāditya among the Imperial Guptas is not known from any other source Thus the only alternative left to us is to place Narasimha Gupta, his son Kumāra Gupta, and the latter's son Visnu Gupta in the first half of the sixth century A D.

From the above discussions it would appear that Puru Gupta

[7] *IHQ*, xix, p 275
[8] *IHQ*, xxiv, p 67
[9] *B C Law Volume* I. p 620.

evidently succeeded Skanda Gupta in c. 467 A.D. and ruled for nine years up to c. 476 A.D., when his son Budha Gupta succeeded him on the Imperial throne. Kumāra Gupta of the Sarnath record was evidently a *goptā* under Puru Gupta.

The dates of Budha Gupta are known to us and he evidently ruled for twenty years, c. 476 A.D.—495/6 A.D. According to the Chinese sources, Tathāgatarāja ruled after Budha Gupta but before Bālāditya, i.e., Narasiṃha Gupta. The epigraphic records, on the other hand, show that Vainya Gupta was ruling in c. 507 A.D. as mahārāja and later on as mahārājādhirāja. It is, therefore, tempting to identify Tathāgatarāja with Vainya Gupta. According to the *She-kia-fang-che*, Tathāgatarāja was associated with monastery of Nalanda, while the discovery of Vainya Gupta's seal from the same place proves that the latter was also associated with the same institution. The only fact that goes against the proposed identification is that Vainya Gupta does not adopt the *biruda* of Tathāgata We may note in this connection that according to the *Ārya-mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa*,[10] after the death of Budha, two kings in the Gupta line were crowned, one in Magadha and another in Gauḍa. If there be any truth in the statement, then we have to hold that after the death of Budha Gupta there was a partition of the Gupta empire, and Vainya Gupta, who was originally a governor, declared his independence in the Vaṅga-Samataṭa region.

Bālāditya rāja (Narasiṃha Gupta), who ruled after Tathāgata rāja, is expressedly called 'the king of Magadha' in the Chinese records. Bālāditya's successor Vajra is stated in the Chinese records as ruling immediately before a king of Mid-India. This king of Mid-India can be no other than Yaśodharman,[11] who in his Mandasor inscription of 532 A.D. claims victory over the kings of the east and the north (v. 7), and in another Mandasor record claims to have conquered the lands as far as the Lauhitya[12]

Thus between c.495-6 A.D., the last known date of Budha

[10] *AMMK*, Text, pp. 49-50.
[11] *PHAI*, p. 597
[12] *Corpus*, iii, p 146f, 152ff.

Gupta, and c.532 A.D. there ruled Tathāgata rāja—(Vainya Gupta), Narasiṃha Gupta Bālāditya, and Vajra. The question now arises—whether we should place Kumāra Gupta II, son of Narasiṃha Gupta Bālāditya, and Kumāra Gupta's son Viṣṇu before Vajra?

Bālāditya is said to have defeated the Hūṇa king Mihirakula, the son of Toramāna. We have got an inscription of Toramāna from Eran dated in the first year of his reign,[13] and another of Mihirakula from Gwalior dated in the fifteenth regnal year.[14] Now, from Eran we have got the inscription of Bhānu Gupta, evidently a governor under the Imperial Guptas, as already stated, dated 510 A.D. Thus Toramāna must have conquered Eran in or after 510 A.D. i.e., the first year of Toramāna's rule in the interior of India would be equivalent to 510 A.D. or 510 A.D. + x. It has been argued by some scholars that Bhānu Gupta's inscription proves the end of the Hūṇa rule in the interior of India in 510 A.D. We shall later on discuss fully about the rule of the Hūṇas or the Epthalites in India, and may state here only that such a theory goes against the available Chinese evidences, which if interpreted properly, prove beyond doubt that the Hūṇa rule could not have commenced in India before 510 A.D. The *Records*, on the other hand, inform us that Mihirakula was defeated by Bālāditya, and after this defeat he took refuge in Kashmir.[15] Since the Gwalior record of Mihirakula is dated in his fifteenth regnal year, Bālāditya's victory over Mihirakula must have taken place sometimes after 525 A.D. Bālāditya evidently died a little after this victory, and as Vajra appears to have ruled before Yaśodharman (532 A.D.) he must be regarded as the immediate successor of Bālāditya. This shows that we have hardly any room for the rule of Bālāditya's son and grandson, Kumāra Gupta II and Viṣṇu Gupta, before 532 A.D.

If the above view be accepted, then the Damodarpur inscription of 543-4 A.D. referring to "*paramadaivata-paramabhattāraka-*

[13] *Corpus*, iii. pp 159f
[14] *ib*, pp 162f.
[15] *infra*, p. 237.

mahārājādhirāja-Śrī......Gupta"[16] should be ascribed to either Kumāra Gupta II or to his son Viṣṇu Gupta, and not to any early king of the so-called Later Gupta dynasty. It may be pointed out here that in the Aphsad inscription, which discloses the early history of the dynasty, no king before Ādityasena, who ruled in the later part of the seventh century A.D., is given any Imperial distinction. On the other hand, titles like *śrī, deva, kṣitīśacudāmaṇi* etc. given to the monarchs show that they had no Imperial pretensions.[17] The Damodarpur record, on the other hand, shows clearly that the ruler referred to therein was certainly an Imperial suzerain.

It is difficult to determine how long the rule of Kumāra Gupta II, to whom should be ascribed the famous Bhitari seal, and of his son Viṣṇu Gupta, identified with *Candrāditya* of the coins,[18] continued. The assumption of the title of mahārājādhirāja by the Maukhari king Iśānavarman, who extended his arms as far as the land of Gauda, as stated in the Haraha inscription of 554 A.D.,[19] and the absence of any Gupta record from North India, appear to prove that the rule of the Imperial Guptas came to an end sometime before 554 A.D.[20]

In the western part of the empire, however, there is no definite proof of Gupta rule after 510 A.D., i.e., after the period of the Hūṇa occupation of the territory. The Betul (518 A.D.) and the Khoh (529 A.D.) *plates* of the *Parivrājaka* m. Samkhoba refer to "*the enjoyment of the sovereignty of the Gupta kings*",[21] but mention no name of the Gupta monarch. This non-mention appears to be somewhat significant, specially when we find that the Khoh inscription of Śarvanātha of 513 A.D. is altogether silent regarding the Guptas.[22] In case of the Maitrakas of Valabhī,

[16] *Ep Ind* xv. pp. 142f; xvii pp. 193f. Basak suggests Budha Gupta, while Krishna Sastri restores the name as Kumāra Gupta Dr B. C. Sen thinks that he may be Dāmodaragupta of the Later Gupta dynasty.

[17] *Corpus,* iii. pp 200ff.

[18] *PHAI,* p. 592.

[19] *Ep Ind.* xiv. p. 111.

[20] If a tradition recorded by Jinasena is to be believed the Gupta power came to an end in 551 A.D.

[21] *Corpus,* iii, p. 112; *Ep. Ind.,* viii, p. 284.

[22] *Corpus,* iii, p. 126f

who began to rule as subordinates under the Imperial Guptas, possibly during the time of Budha Gupta, we find that the phrase "*paramabhattāraka-pādānudhyāta*" occurs in the inscription of Dhruvasena I, who ruled at least up to 545 A.D. Such instances remind us of the history of the Later Mughals. The old emperor Shah Alam was confined in Delhi, the Mughal empire was torn to pieces, and independent lords were ruling in different tracts. But they all owed nominal allegiance to the old emperor, and some even issued coins in his name. In the case of the Guptas, it may be said that references to them by the Parivrājaka and the Maitraka kings show that they were still maintaining a precarious existence in some corner of the Āryāvarta, while the empire had been parcelled out among the *de facto* independent lords.

PURU GUPTA

The account of the Bhitari record seems to show that even after the Hūṇa inroads, the Gupta empire remained intact, and there is no reason to think that the same suffered any diminution during the time of Skanda Gupta. The statements of the Balaghat plates that the sovereignty of the Vākātaka king Narendrasena embraced Kośala, Mekala and Mālava[1] indicate that he contested the sovereignty of the Guptas over the Malwa region, and as this evidently happened in the last part of his reign after he had been freed of the troubles from the Nalas, it appears that he made some conquests at the expense of Puru Gupta, the successor of Skanda Gupta. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that "not a single inscription or coin has yet been discovered which shows that Surāshtra and Western Malwa formed parts of the Gupta empire after the death of Skanda Gupta". Further, the Mandasor inscription which refers to the rule of Kumāra Gupta I in 436 A.D. is conspicuously silent regarding the emperor in 472 A.D., when the later part of the record was completed.

The absence of any epigraphic record seems to suggest that Puru Gupta's reign was really a troublesome one. It is extreme-

[1] *Ep Ind.*, ix. p. 271.

ly doubtful whether we have got any gold coin belonging to his age, for, as S. K. Saraswati has shown, the gold coins attributed by Allan to Puru Gupta belong really to Budha Gupta.[2] Dr. R. K. Mookerjee and other scholars think that we have got an important literary source regarding Puru Gupta in Paramārtha's *Life of Vasubandhu* which states that king Vikramāditya of Ayodhya became a patron of Buddhism through the influence of Vasubandhu, whom he appointed as a tutor of his son Bālāditya. It is further stated that when Bālāditya became king he invited Vasubandhu to his court at Ayodhya. It has been held that as Puru Gupta's son Narasiṃha Gupta takes the title of Bālāditya on the coins he must be supposed to have been the patron of the Buddhist teacher. The theory, however, cannot be fully accepted in the present state of our knowledge, for, while Takakusu thinks that Vasubandhu flourished in the second part of the fifth century A.D., M. Peri contends that the teacher lived in the fourth century A.D and died about the middle of that century.[3] Further, there is hardly any evidence that Puru Gupta took the title of Vikramāditya, for the coins with the legend Śrī Vikrama can no longer be attributed to him

BUDHA GUPTA

Puru Gupta was succeeded by his son Budha Gupta about 476 A.D. Budha Gupta's inscriptions have been found at Damodarpur in North Bengal, Sarnath, Eran and other places.[4] Dr. R K. Mookerjee thinks that "it will thus appear that the empire under Budha Gupta recovered its position and prestige after the dark age following the death of Skanda Gupta".[5] We think, however, that there is hardly any basis for such a theory. There is no evidence that he had control over the Western Malwa region, Surāstra or Cambay, though his suzerainty may have been vaguely acknowledged in these areas.

It was possibly during his reign that the Maitrakas came to

[2] *IC*, i p 692 contra, Jagannath, *AIOC*, 1946, Sec ix 11.
[3] *supra*, p. 209, f n. 28.
[4] *vide*, Bibliography
[5] Mookerjee, *The Gupta Empire*, p 121.

power in Valabhī under the leadership of one Senāpati Bhaṭāraka. The third king of the dynasty mahārāja Droṇasimha states in a record of 502 A.D. that he was *parama-bhaṭṭāraka-pādānudhyāta* showing that he was not yet an independent ruler and evidently acknowledged the overlordship of the Guptas. Droṇasiṃha's predecessors, Dharasena, his elder brother, and Bhatāraka, his father, had the title of Senāpati. This evidently shows that the dynasty was gradually rising to power and continued to rule in Valabhī for about 225 years, up to c. 770 A.D.[6]

Budha Gupta issued the peacock type of the silver coinage which was meant for circulation in the central part of the empire. His last known date is 495/6 A.D. found on one of his coins.[7]

THE EPTHALITES

As we have already stated, Budha Gupta's successor was possibly Tathāgatarāja-Vainya Gupta. Tathāgatarāja-Vainya Gupta was succeeded by his brother Narasiṃha Gupta, during whose time the Hūnas again invaded India and established an empire in the sub-continent. These Hūṇas were really the Epthalites, also called the White Huns, who were originally subordinate under the Juan-Juan or the Avars of Chinese Turkistan,

[6] *vide*, ch. ix.

[7] From the epigraphic records we learn of the governors and the feudatory chiefs who ruled under Budha Gupta. Two of his governors of Northern Bengal, Brahmadatta and Jayadatta used the title *Uparika-mahārāja* instead of *Uparika* as was the practice in the time of Kumāra Gupta I Another governor, Suraśmicandra using the title of mahārāja ruled over the territory between the Kālindī and the Narmadā rivers and under him another mahārāja Mātṛviṣnu governed the district of Airikina or Eran in 484 A D. Several epigraphic records on the other hand, disclose the existence of a dynasty of Parivrājaka mahārājas, so called because they were descendants from the royal ascetic Suśarman, owing allegiance to the Gupta overlords Contiguous to this kingdom lay another with Uccakalpa as the capital ruled over by two kings Jayanātha and his son Śarvanātha From the facts that in the records of Jayanātha and Śarvanātha there is no reference to the Guptas it has been inferred that these Uccakalpa monarchs were subordinates under the Parivrājakas (*IHQ*, xxi p. 137).

and they suddenly grew very powerful and began attacking their neighbours. They eventually attacked the empire of the Guptas and made the Gupta emperor Bālāditya a vassal under them, who, however, was fortunate ultimately in driving them out from the heart of the Āryāvarta, and re-established the glorious tradition of his predecessors. Before we take up the history of the White Huns in India proper, we have to decide who they were, and when actually they entered into the heart of India, as much confusions still prevail on these points.

Some scholars believe that the Epthalites were of Hunnish or Hiung-nu origin. The Chinese writers are, however, always careful to distinguish between the Hiung-nus or the Hūṇas proper, that quarrelled with the Yueh-chi and compelled them to move towards the west in the second century B.C., and the Ye-ti-li-do or Ye-da i.e. the Epthalites. They further inform us that the real name of the people was Hua. As McGovern says: "According to one Chinese chronicle the Epthalites were ultimately of the same origin as the Yueh-chi, according to another they were a branch of the people who inhabited Gushi or Turfan. According to the latter version the Epthalites were descended from a group of Turfanese who in A.D. 126 aided the Chinese general Bang-yung in his attack upon the Northern Huns and who afterwards settled in Zungaria".[8]

Thus if the Chinese account is to be believed the Epthalites were a branch of the Yueh-chis, and it would be wrong to think of them as the Huns. In Zungaria, the Epthalites and the Hiung-nus or the Huns lived in close proximity, and thus in Europe as well as in India, they came to be regarded as a separate branch of the Huns. Thus Procopius says: "The Epthalites are of Hunnish race and bears the Hunnish names, but they are completely different from the Huns whom we know. They alone among the Hunnish people have white skin and regular features."[9]

Though the main body of the Epthalites had thus been settled in Zungaria, a small branch of them possibly carved out

[8] *EECA*, pp 404-5
[9] *ib.*

another settlement on the Indian borderland Thus Orosius who composed his account towards the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century A.D. states that "between the sources of the Ganges and those of the river Ottorogorras, situated to the north in the region of the Paropamisades mountains, the Taurus mountain extends. The Caucasus mountain extends between the sources of the Ottorogorras and the town of Ottorogorras through the country of the Chuni, Scythes, and Gandarides." The variants given in the different manuscripts for Chuni are Chunnos, Funos, Hunnas and Hunnus.[10] Thus about 400 A D. there was no Epthalite settlement in India proper, though they had been knocking at the door of the country. The condition seems to have been the same a hundred years later, for, from the Chinese sources Chavannes describes the extent of the Epthalite empire in c 500 A D. as comprising Tokharistan, Kabulistan and Zabulistan, but no part of India proper.[11]

The Bhitari Pillar inscription of Skanda Gupta, as we have already stated, refers to his terrible fight with the Hūnas in which the latter were defeated. The Epthalites evidently made an unsuccessful bid to found an empire in India. The next landmark in the Epthalite history is furnished by the account of Sung-yun, who passed through Gandhāra and Udyāna (Swat valley) about 520 A D. and has left an account of the Ye-tha.

Thus it would appear that between c.500 and 520 A D., the Epthalites entered India proper. Such an interpretation is corroborated by a critical study of three inscriptions from Eran Thus an inscription of Budha Gupta of the year 484 A D informs us that the region lying between the Yamuna and the Narmada was governed by one mahārāja Suraśmicandra, while one Mātrvisṇu was the *visayapati* of the division of Airikina or Eran.[12] Another inscription from the same place of the year 510 A.D. shows that king Bhānu Gupta went there with the purpose of conquest and his general Goparāja fell in battle

[10] *JGIS*, 1943.

[11] Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tourkiue Occidentaux*, pp 224-5.

[12] *Corpus*, iii. p 89

there, while the latter's wife became a *satī*.[13] The third inscription is dated in the first year of Toramāna's reign, the Epthalite king, and Dhanyavisṇu, the brother of Mātrvisṇu, had been acknowledging the sway of the Epthalite lord.[14] The above epigraphs clearly show that sometimes after 484 A.D, the visaya of Airikina passed from the Guptas to the Epthalites, but as we have already stated, scholars are divided in their opinion regarding the time of the incident. According to some scholars, the Epthalite conquest of Eran and the interior of India began in c.510 A.D., and the inscription of that year shows that Bhānu Gupta came to check the inroad but failed. Others hold that the Epthalite occupation of the interior of India came to an end in 510 A.D. by the conquest of Bhānu Gupta.

TORAMĀNA

As we have an inscription of Toramāna dated in his first regnal year and another of Mihirakula dated in his sixteenth regnal year, it may be assumed that the Epthalite occupation of the interior of India lasted at least for 17 years. Now if we hold that the Epthalite rule came to an end in c.510 A.D., then it must be assumed that the rule of the foreigners in the interior of India began in c.493 A.D., or a little earlier. But the Chinese sources, as pointed out by Chavannes, clearly indicate that as late as 500 A.D., "no part of India proper" was included within the Epthalite empire. Further, the Si-yu-ki states that the Epthalite rule in India proper was put to an end by Bālāditya, and there is absolutely no proof that Bhānu Gupta ever assumed that title. The complete silence of the record of 510 A.D. regarding the achievement of any victory by Bhānu Gupta shows that he evidently could not fare well in the battle referred to. Possibly, Bhānu Gupta went to check the Epthalite advance into the interior of India, but failed. Thus we get the synchronism:

c 510 A.D. = *the first year of Toramāna's rule in the interior of India.*

[13] *Corpus*, iii, pp. 92f
[14] *ib*, pp 159ff

Thus we have two distinct phases of Epthalite invasion of India—one during the time of Skanda Gupta (456-67 A.D.) which ended in failure, and the other about 510 A.D., which led to the rule of the Epthalites in the heart of India at least for 17 years.

We propose to date the Kura inscription a little before c. 510 A.D. It records the construction of a Buddhist monastery by one Roṭa-Siddhavrddhi, the son of Rota-Jayavrddhi, for the teachers of the Mahiśāsaka school, dated "in the prosperous reign of king of kings, the great king Toramāna-Sāhi-Jauvala, in the ..the year, on the second (lunar day) of the bright half of the month of Mārgaśira".[14a] Bühler and Kielhorn think that the Toramāna of the Kura inscription cannot be identical with the Epthalite king of the same name since the former uses the epithet *Jauvala* which is supposed to have been a feudatory title. In this connection, we may note the following account of Gandhāra, as given by the Chinese traveller Sung-yun in 520 A.D.:

> "This is the country which the Ye-thas destroyed and afterwards set up a tegin (prince or member of the royal family) to be king over the country, since which events two generations have passed".

As we have already indicated, Mihirakula had been ruling in 520 A.D., and thus the above Chinese account would point to a time when Toramāna had been living. Toramāna evidently started his career as a *tegin* under the supreme Epthalite lord living in Bactria and later on declared his independence in c. 510 A.D. Thus there is really no difficulty in identifying the Toramāna of the Kura record with Toramāna, the father of Mihirakula. Other evidences bearing on the reign of this monarch may be summarised as follows .

(a) There are some silver coins of the *"Horseman type"* with the Epthalite symbol behind the horse-man on the *Obv.* and the legend in Greek characters Sāhi Javula or Sāhi Janabula, with the usual fire-altar and supporters on the *rev.* These coins were evi-

[14a] *Ep Ind.* i pp. 239f.

dently issued when Toramāna was still a subordinate ruler, i e., before 510 A.D.

(b) The small copper-coins attributed to Toramāna are found both in the Punjab and in the country between the Sutlej and the Yamunā. Their attribution is based on the type of the *"Sun"* with the abbreviated name Tora in large letters.

(c) Udyotana Suri in his Prākrit work *Kuvalayamālā* compiled in 699 S.E. = A.D. 777, states that the celebrated town of Pavvaiya, on the banks of the river Candrabhāgā, was the residence of Torarāya or Toramāna.[15]

MIHIRAKULA

From the Gwalior inscription of the year 15, it appears that Toramāna was succeeded by his son Mihirakula. For the reign of this prince, we are fortunate in having accounts left by Sung-yun, Cosmas Indicopleustis and Yuan Chwang. We are furnished with the following brief details by the Chinese sources regarding Sung-yun :

"Towards the beginning of the sixth century (518) an Empress of the Wei dynasty sent an official mission to India to offer presents to the Buddhist sanctuaries and bring back Buddhist texts from India. The official envoy was one Song yun. A Buddhist monk named Hui-sheng was asked to accompany him. Song yun and his companions followed the southern route of Central Asia—Shen-shen (near Lobnor), Tso-mo (Chalmadana, modern Cherchen) and Khotan. From Khotan they went to Karghalik, Wakhan and Chitral. They then followed the valleys of Yasin and Gilgit and ultimately reached Bolar to the north-west of Kashmir. The visit of Song yun was restricted to north-west of India, specially to Uddiyāna (the Swat valley) and Gandhāra (the region of Peshawar). Song yun returned to China in 522 and compiled an account of his journey which is now lost" [16]

[15] *SI*, pp. 76f

[16] Bagchi, *India and China*, p. 74.

Portions of the account of Sung-yun survives in the quotations of the later writers, and his account of Oddiyāna and Gandhāra has been translated by Chavannes, in *BEFEO,* 1903. An English translation of the same is also given by Beal in his *Records of the Western World,* Vol. I, pp. lxxiv ff. Thus speaking of Gandhāra, Sung-yun states : "During the middle decade of the fourth month of the first year of Ching-Kwong (520 A.D), we entered the kingdom of Gandhāra. This country closely resembles the territory of U-chang It was formerly called the country of Ye-po-lo. This is the country which the Ye-thas destroyed, and afterwards set up a tegin to be king over the country, since which events two generations have passed. The disposition of this king was cruel and vindictive and he practised the most barbarous atrocities. He did not believe the law of the Buddha, but loved to worship demons . . Entirely self-reliant on his own strength, he had entered on a war with the country of Ki-pin (Kashmir), disputing the boundaries of their kingdom, and his troops had been already engaged in it for three years. The king has 700 war elephants The king continually abode with his troops on the frontier and never returned to his kingdom, in consequence of which the old men had to labour and the common people were oppressed".

From the above account of Sung-yun, we can pick up the following facts :

(a) The Ye-thas or the Epthalites conquered the Gandhāra region and set up a *tegin* there two generations before c 520 A D. (We have already pointed out that this event must have occurred after c. 500 A.D, and Toramāna was possibly the *tegin* in question).

(b) The contemporary king i.e. Mihirakula was non-Buddhist and had entered in war with the kingdom of Kashmir, and it was still going on about the time of the visit of the Chinese traveller i.e., c. 520 A D.

(c) The seat of the king Mihirakula was Gandhāra i.e., to the west of the Indus.

Yuan Chwang has preserved a long story about Mihirakula and it differs in details from the one given above by Sung-yun. The account may be summarised as follows :[17]

(a) Mihirakula, who lived some centuries before the time of Yuan Chwang, had his capital at Śākala, the present Sialkot region, and was the lord of a considerable portion of India.

(b) When Bālāditya-rāja, king of Magadha, "heard of the cruel persecution and atrocities of Mihirakula, he strictly guarded the frontiers of his kingdom and *refused to pay tribute*". (This shows that the Gupta king of Magadha was a vassal under him).

(c) Leaving the charge of his kingdom to his younger brother, Mihirakula marched against Bālāditya but was defeated and taken prisoner. Later on he was, however, released at the intervention of Bālāditya's mother.

(d) Mihirakula's brother had in the meantime usurped the throne, and he then sought and obtained an asylum in Kashmir. Later on, he killed the king of Kashmir and "placed himself on the throne"

(e) He next killed the king of Gandhāra, overthrew the stūpas, destroyed the samghārāmas, "altogether one thousand six hundred foundations"

(f) He died within a year

While Yuan Chwang is clearly wrong in placing Mihirakula *"some centuries"* before his time, there is some fundamental difference between his account and the one written by Sung-yun. Sung-yun makes Mihirakula pre-eminently the king of Gandhāra, while, according to Yuan Chwang, his capital was Śākala and he was the lord of practically the whole of North India, his overlordship extending over Magadha as well. The account of Cosmas throws reconciliating light on this point. Thus he says · "Higher up in India, that is farther to the north, are the White Huns. The one called Gollas when going to war takes with him, it is said, no fewer than two thousand

[17] Beal, *Records*, i 167ff.

elephants and a great force of cavalry. He is the lord of India, and oppressing the people, forces them to pay tribute.....The river Phison (Indus) separates all the countries of India from the country of the Huns". Thus the Hūṇa kingdom proper lay to the west of the Indus, (*cf.* Sung-yun), but Mihirakula had extended his sway over a great portion of North India. (*cf.* Yuan Chwang). This evidently happened after c. 510 A.D. but Sung-yun knew nothing about this extension of the Epthalite power. The Betul plates of 518 A.D. refer to the Gupta rule and thus Mihirakula's conquest must have taken place after that date. The recent discovery of a seal of Toramāna from Kauśāmbī tends to support Yuan Chwang's account. What is not clear from the *Si-yu-ki* is the statement that Mihirakula killed the king of Gandhāra. From Sung-yun's account it is clear that Gandhāra was the chief province of the Epthalite empire. Was it subsequently lost in the time of Mihirakula who made Śākala his capital? Or, was it under the occupation of Mihirakula's brother who had usurped the throne in his absence? We cannot be definite about the problem unless fresh evidences come forth.

It is thus apparent that there is some confusion in the account of the Si-yu-ki, and it cannot be denied at the same time that the Buddhist writers were biased against him for his unsympathetic attitude towards their religion. Sung-yun represents him as worshipping the demons, but his coins clearly show that he was a devotee of Śiva, while the Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman describes him as bowing his head only to that god.

Kalhana has preserved an account of Mihirakula's reign in Kashmir, which, though nothing but legendary, may contain some historical truth. Mihirakula "who was comparable to the god of destruction", is thus credited in the *Rājataraṅgiṇī*:

> "For in Śrīnagarī, the foul-minded man founded the temple of Mihireśvara and in Holadā a big city named Mihirapura. (I. 306)
>
> "The Brāhmaṇas of Gandhāra accepted from him gifts of Agrahāras; they, no doubt, too, were of similar

character as his own and were the meanest Brāhmaṇas. (I. 307).

In writing the above account, Kalhana evidently relied on traditions current in his time and they may contain some historical elements. It is not unlikely that Mihireśvara in the above passage refers to god Śiva, the deity worshipped by Mihirakula, though we cannot be very sure on the point. Similarly, uncertain is the meaning of *line 3* of the Gwalior inscription, which runs as follows:

> "*Tasyo (Toramānasyo) dita-kulakīrteḥ putrotulavikramaḥ patih prthvyāḥ, Mihirakuletikhyāto (a *) bhaṅgo yaḥ Paśupatiṃ * * **".

Fleet translates the above passage thus: "Of him, the fame of whose family has risen high, the son (is) he, of unequal prowess, the lord of the earth, who is renowned under the name of Mihirakula, (and) who, (himself) unbroken, (broke the power of) Paśupati".[18] Bhandarkar, however, wants to read *bheje* in the lacuna and interprets the term *abhaṅga* as meaning "who was unbroken in the matter of worshipping" the god Paśupati. If we accept Bhandarkar's interpretation, then it may be taken as another evidence of showing Mihirakula's leaning towards Śaivism.

We have already seen that according to the *Si-yu-ki*, Mihirakula was defeated by king Bālāditya (Narasiṃha Gupta) of Magadha, and then he took refuge in Kashmir. The Mandasor inscription of Yaśodharman, on the other hand, gives us the following account:

> "He (i.e., Yaśodharman) to whose two feet respect was paid with complimentary presents of the flowers from the lock of hair on the top of his head, by even that famous king Mihirakula, whose head had never previously been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save the god Sthāṇu, and embraced by whose arms the Himālaya falsely prides itself on being styled an inaccessible fortress, and whose forehead was pained through being now for the first time

[18] *Corpus*, iii. p 163.

> bent low down by the strength of his (Yaśodharman's) arm in the act of compelling obeisance."[19]

The above account thus gives the impression that Mihirakula was defeated for the first time by Yaśodharman, and further that the former was the king in some Himalayan country. If the *Si-yu-ki*, on the other hand, is to be believed, Mihirakula became king in the Himalayan country of Kashmir after being defeated by Bālāditya Thus the above two accounts appear at the first sight to be contradictory In this connection, we may note, however, that in another Mandasor inscription of the year 589 = 532 A D. it is stated that Yaśodharman acquired the title of Rājādhirāja-Parameśvara after defeating the kings of the north and the east[20] The kings of the north included evidently Mihirakula of Kashmir whose defeat at the hand of the Mandasor monarch may thus be tentatively dated c. 530 A.D. Now the Khoh Copper plate of 529 A.D. refers to the rule of the Guptas, showing that while Mihirakula's defeat at the hands of Bālāditya must be ascribed before this date, the rise of Yaśodharman should be ascribed after it. We have already seen that the Betul plate of 518 A D. refers to the Guptas and after it there is no record from this part of the country mentioning the Imperial dynasty till the Khoh plates This proves conclusively that Mihirakula's rise and fall in the interior of the Āryāvarta must have occurred between 518 and 529 A.D. Yaśodharman must have come to power after 529 A.D., for Yuan Chwang speaks of a king of Central India as the successor of Vajra, the son of Bālāditya, and this king of Central India has rightly been identified with Yaśodharman. Thus it appears that Yaśodharman came to power after the time of Bālāditya, and hence the latter's victory over the Hūna king must have preceded the conquests of Yaśodharman. This is also indirectly proved by the statement of the Mandasor inscription that "embraced by whose (Mihirakula's) arms the Himālaya falsely prides itself on being styled an inaccessible fortress", for before his defeat at the hands of Bālāditya, Mihirakula was the lord of a

[19] *Select Ins.*, p. 395, f n 1.
[20] *Corpus*, iii. pp. 152f, verse 7

considerable portion of North India. In that case it may be held that Yaśodharman's claim that he defeated Mihirakula for the first time is nothing but a hyperbolic statement. With the defeat of Mihirakula, the Hūṇas or the Epthalites disappear from the field of Indian politics as an important factor. There are of course evidences that they continued as local dynasties, and ultimately formed an important element in the Indian population.

V

The Disintegration of the Gupta Empire

YASODHARMAN

The Guptas thus withstood the shock of the Epthalite invasion, but it shattered the very foundation of their empire. The feudatory dynasties now came to the forefront and though they still acknowledged the nominal sway of the Imperial master, they became practically the *de facto* independent rulers. Further, as already indicated, there soon arose a new danger in the person of Yaśodharman, whose existence is disclosed to us by two inscriptions from Mandasor.[1] One of them bears the date 532-33 A.D. and contains the information that he had subjugated "very mighty kings of the east and many (kings) of the north". This brief account is elucidated by the other record which states that his empire extended from the Lauhitya or the Brahmaputra in the east to the Western Ocean; and from the mountain washed by the Ganges i.e., the Himālaya to the Mahendra mountain; that his empire included countries not enjoyed by the lords of the Guptas or the kings of the Hūṇas; and, as we have already seen, that his feet was worshipped by Mihirakula.

Dr. D. C. Sircar has shown that the above account is more or less a conventional one, and it is a praśasti which may have germs of some truth, but may not be entirely historical. Indeed, in spite of all the bombastic claims it appears that the Guptas

[1] *Corpus*, iii pp. 142ff.

16

continued to rule in Eastern India. Some scholars think that he defeated and killed Vajra, the son of Bālāditya and extinguished the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍravardhana.[2] Now in the *Si-yu-ki* we get the following account: "To the west of this monastery (Nālandā), Bālāditya's son and successor Vajra built another; and to the north of this the king of Mid-India afterwards erected a large monastery". From this it can hardly be inferred, as it has been done, that Bālāditya's son Vajra was killed by a king of Mid-India, who of course appears to be no other than Yaśodharman. This only shows that Yaśodharman lived after Vajra, who evidently had a very brief reign, and made some contributions to the Buddhist institution. That such Chinese accounts had nothing to do with the *"genealogy"* or the *political events,* but to record simply the names of the donors of the Nalanda monastery one after another, becomes clear from a study of the *Shi-kia-fang-che,* as noted before.

There is thus no evidence to show that the rule of the Guptas came to an end, even temporarily, due to the conquests of Yaśodharman, whose empire evidently comprised parts of the Ganges-Jumna valley in the east. Hardly anything is known definitely regarding the ancestry of Yaśodharman or how his rule came to an end. While editing the Bihar Kotra inscription of Naravarman's time of the Mālava year 474 = 417 A.D., S. N. Chakravarti came to the conclusion that Naravarman and Yaśodharman belonged to the same family, since both of them are described as *Aulikara.*[3] This is, however, far from convincing, since it is not known exactly that Aulikara is a family name, and secondly, even if it be so, there is hardly any reason for such a conclusion, when we find that family names like Maukhari etc., are given to different dynasties having no connections.[4]

Before Yaśodharman's rise, Mandasor and the adjoining regions evidently passed through some confusions which possibly facilitated his coming to the throne. The Ajanta record claims that Hariṣeṇa, the Vākāṭaka, conquered or extended his sphere

[2] *PHAI,* p. 597.
[3] *Ep Ind.* xxvi. pp 130f.
[4] For the Maukharis, *infra,* Ch. viii.

of influence over Gujarāt, Mālava, Kośala, Andhra and Kuntala provinces.[5] The date of Hariseṇa is far from certain, but he may be assigned with plausibility to the first quarter of the sixth century A.D. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that it was during the trouble and confusion following the invasion of Toramāna that he invaded the distracted province of Mālava and obtained some success.[6] It is not unlikely that he was ultimately defeated by Yaśodharman whose empire extended in the west up to the Arabian Sea. The Mandasor inscription of 532 A.D. shows that Abhayadatta had been ruling the land, lying between the Vindhya and the Pāriyātra and extending as far as the Arabian Sea, as a viceroy of Yaśodharman.

It is generally believed that Yaśodharman's rule came to an end about 535 A.D. The myth associated with the family of the Vikramāditya had by this time been completely broken and two of the feudatory dynasties, the *Maukharis* and the so-called *Later Guptas* now came to the forefront. After the fall of the Imperial dynasty in the middle of the sixth century, these two families practically dominated the political arena of North India till the rise of Harsavardhana in 606 A.D.

MAUKHARIS & LATER GUPTA

Both the Maukharis and the Later Guptas evidently started as subordinates under the Imperial Guptas, possibly at the same time, since Iśānavarman, the fourth Maukhari king was a contemporary of Kumāra Gupta, the fourth Later Gupta monarch.[7] As the Haraha inscription shows that Iśānavarman[8] had become a mahārājādhirāja by 554 A.D., it may be assumed that the Gupta dynasty had come to an end a little before that date, and that the dynasty of Iśānavarman came into existence c. 510 A.D., during the confusions caused by the Epthalite inroads, when the Later Guptas also came to power.

[5] *Select Ins*, p. 429
[6] *VGA*, p. 186.
[7] *vide*, Appendix iii & iv
[8] *Ep. Ind.* xiv. pp 110f.

The designation *'Later Gupta'* is somewhat a misleading one. They had no connection evidently with the Imperial Gupta line, since Kṛṣṇagupta, the first king of the dynasty, is simply said to belong to *Sad-vaṃśa,* a good family, in the Aphsad inscription. In an age when we find a tendency "of the court-writers to exaggerate the importance of the royal families even to the extent of giving them pedegrees reaching not only to epic heroes but also to the sun and the moon, it must be regarded as very surprising that no allusion should have been made in their inscriptions to any connection with the Imperial Guptas if there were even any remote basis for it.[9] The dynasty has been so named because most of the family members bear names ending in *gupta,* though the greatest monarch of the line had the name of Ādityasena. Evidently—*gupta* was a part of their names and not a sur-name, as it had been the case with the Imperial Guptas.

There has been a great controversy regarding the *original home* of the dynasty. While editing the inscriptions of the Later Guptas, Fleet concluded that Magadha was the home of the dynasty, and this theory was later on accepted by R. D. Banerjee and others. There are, however, a group of historians who had challenged the view and they concluded that Mālava, and not Magadha, was the original home in question.[10] They give the following arguments in support of their theory:

(a) The Deo-Baranark inscription of Jīvitagupta II[11] records the continuance of the grant of a village in South Bihar by Bālāditya-deva and after him by the Maukharis Sarvavarman and Avantivarman. There is no mention of the Later Gupta contemporaries in connection with the previous grants of the village. "The inscription is no doubt damaged, but

[9] *VGA,* p. 191.

[10] For the Malwa home theory, D. C Ganguli, *JBORS,* xix p 402; R K. Mookerjee, *JBORS,* xv p. 251f, *Harsa,* pp 60, 67; Vaidya, *HMHI,* i p. 35; Raychaudhuri, *JBORS,* xv. pp 651f For R. D. Banerjee's views *JBORS,* xiv pp. 254ff. B P. Sinha has elaborately discussed this question, *DKM,* pp. 130ff.

[11] *Corpus,* iii. pp. 213ff, no. 46

the sovereignty of Sarvavarman and Avantivarman undoubtedly precludes the possibility of the direct rule of their contemporaries of the Later Gupta line."

(b) The Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill cave inscriptions[12] disclose the existence of subordinate Maukhari chiefs of the Gaya district "in the time of the Later Guptas".

(c) When Yuan Chwang visited Magadha he found one Pūrṇavarman on the throne of the country.[13] "He does not say a word about Mādhavagupta or his father in connection with Magadha".

(d) Bāṇa in his *Harsacarita* speaks of the father of Mādhavagupta, the associate of Harsa as the king of Mālava. "The existence of two associates of Harṣa, each bearing the name of Mādhavagupta, one of whom was the son of a king of Magadha is not known to the biographer of the great emperor."

The above arguments can hardly be accepted as conclusive, for, they do not take into account all the available facts concerned. The absence of the mention of any early Later Gupta king in the Deo-Baranark record shows simply that they had nothing to do with the grant of the village in question. This reminds us of the Chinese accounts regarding the donors of the Nalanda vihāra. Names of the kings who made no contribution have been deliberately left out, and as we have already said, such accounts have got hardly any political significance. What the Deo-Baranark record shows definitely is that after Bālāditya-deva the village in question passed under the Maukhari kings Sarvavarman and Avantivarman. It cannot prove that the Later Guptas had no jurisdiction over the village before the time of Sarvavarman. Any inference regarding the Later Guptas from the Deo-Baranark record would be a fallacious case of *argumentum ex silentio*.

Secondly, the Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill cave inscriptions

[12] *Corpus,* iii pp 221-28
[13] Watters, *l c* ii. p 115

no doubt disclose the existence of three feudatory Maukhari chiefs Yajñavarman, his son Śārdūlavarman and the latter's son Anantavarman. Palaeographically these inscriptions are placed by scholars in the last part of the fifth century, and further it is clear that these Maukharis had no connections with the dynasty to which Sarvavarman and Avantivarman belonged. Evidently this line consisting of three rulers came to an end sometimes in the first quarter of the sixth century A D, and the Later Guptas may have come to power after the fall of the dynasty.[14]

Drs. B C. Sen and R. S. Tripathi think that the Later Guptas originally ruled in Magadha and in the last quarter of the sixth century migrated to Mālava.[15] This theory has much to commend in itself, and, as we shall see later on, in the last decade of the sixth century there was much confusion in Eastern India owing to the invasions of the Tibetans from the north and this evidently forced the Later Guptas to leave their hearth and home and found a new kingdom somewhere else. This may account for the non-mention of the Later Guptas in connection with Magadha by the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang. Bāṇa's account of Mādhavagupta as the son of the king of Mālava also does not go strictly against the theory that Magadha was the original home of the Later Guptas.

In this connection, we may note that the Aphsad record speaks of Jīvitagupta's exploits on the sea-shore and Mahāsenagupta's victory over Susthitavarman, the Kāmarūpa king. These prove indirectly that the Later Guptas lived in Eastern India, for had they lived in Malwa about this time, they would have been regarded as the Imperial suzerains of North India with a vast empire under them. Again, had Mahāsenagupta extended his conquests from Malwa to Kāmarūpa, he would have done the same evidently at the cost of the Maukharis.[16] But the combined testimony of the Nalanda seal of the mahārājādhirāja Su—and the *Harsacarita* proves beyond doubt that the Mau-

[14] For the dynasty, Appendix iv
[15] *SHAIB*, pp 263f; Tripathi, *HK* p 46.
[16] *DKM*, pp. 138ff.

kharis maintained their Imperial status.[17] On the other hand, again, had such been the case, the Aphsad record would not have given to Mahāsenagupta the humbler designation of Śrī alone

The Later Guptas evidently started their career as subordinates under the Imperial Guptas, and later on became subordinates under the Maukharis. Some misconception still exists regarding the mutual relationship of the two dynasties—the Maukharis and the Later Guptas—when they got a free hand after the downfall of the Imperial Guptas. Thus Dr. Tripathi says: "The Maukharis who had grown rich and prosperous by their possession of the fertile Doab, were also at this time bidding for supremacy in the north, and they had now to be reckoned with before the (Later) Guptas could reclaim the allegiance of the greater part of Northern India. This contest for overlordship between the Maukharis and the Later Guptas forms the most arresting feature of the major portion of the sixth century A.D."[18] Such a notion of long contest between the two powers is based on a misinterpretation of the Aphsad record (*v. II*), and we shall see later on that the struggle was really confined to the reign of Iśānavarman himself, who became the mahārājādhirāja, after the fall of the Imperial Guptas, as proved by the Haraha inscription of 554 A.D. It appears therefore that immediately after the fall of the Imperial line, the Later Guptas of Magadha tried to become independent, but failed and acknowledged the supremacy of the Maukhari chiefs, like Sarvavarman and Avantivarman.

Similarly there is difference of opinions among the scholars regarding the original home of the 'Maukharis. As in the *Harsacarita,* the Maukharis are associated with Kanauj, Tripathi and others think that it was the capital of the line of Iśānavarman from the very beginning.[19] Dr. D. C. Sircar thinks that "about the middle of the sixth century the dynasty of the Imperial Guptas, in whose cause the Maukharis had been fight-

[17] *Infra,* ch viii.
[18] Tripathi, *HK,* p. 24.
[19] *ib*, pp. 32-6.

ing with the Gauḍas, totally collapsed and left the Maukharis in practical possession of large parts of Bihar and U.P."[20] We have already shown that Magadha was the original home of the Later Guptas and that the country subsequently passed under the Maukharis. The earliest Maukhari record of Iśānavarman's ine has been found at Barabanki in the Jaunpur district of he U.P., while the coins of Iśānavarman and his successors have been found in the Faizabad district. This fact seems to show hat the original home of the dynasty was in Eastern U.P. and hey possibly became confined to the Kanauj region after the oreign invasions of North India in the last part of the sixth entury A.D., had brought a tremendous change in the political ondition of the country.

The above discussions clearly indicate that after the rise of Yaśodharman, the power of the Imperial Guptas were confined o the region of Magadha and North Bengal, though their uzerainty was theoretically recognised even in the remote wesern part of North India, as proved by the epigraphic records of he Maitraka king Dhruvasena ranging in date between 525 and 545 A.D

VI

THE FALL OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

It is difficult to determine how exactly the Imperial line of he Guptas came to an end. It has been asserted that the final disappearance of the Gupta rule in Eastern India may be ascribed to two circumstances : (a) "The rise of a ruling dynasty represented by Dharmāditya, Gopacandra and Samācāradeva in Central and South-west Bengal in the first half of the sixth century A D possibly points to the extirpation of the Gupta rule from the whole of Bengal excepting the Pundravardhana-bhukti; and (b) "But the decline of the Guptas in North Bengal may have been mainly due to the encroachments of the kings of Kāmarūpa."[1]

[20] *JRASBL*, xi pp. 69-70.
[1] *IHQ*, xix p. 276

While we may thoroughly agree with the above propositions, the question still remains, how the Gupta rule in Magadha came to an end? A copper plate grant found at Amauna in the Gaya district[2] appears to have been issued by Kumārāmātya-mahārāja Nandana in the year 232 = 551 A.D., and as it contains no reference to the Imperial line it may be assumed that the dynasty had already come to an end. But at the same time the epigraph raises some interesting problems; *firstly,* whose subordinate Nandana was? and *secondly,* as the Later Guptas had their home in Magadha, what part did they play in the overthrow of the dynasty? Before, however, we deal with these questions we should take up the history of the kings Dharmāditya and others who put an end to the rule of the Guptas in the Gauḍa and Vaṅga-Samataṭa regions.

KINGS OF VANGA-SAMATATA

Four copper-plate inscriptions found in the district of Faridpur and another from the village of Mallasarul on the banks of the river Dāmodar in the district of Burdwan disclose the names of three kings, Gopacandra, Dharmāditya and Samācāradeva, and they possibly formed a dynasty.[3] That they were independent sovereigns is proved by their assumption of the title of *mahārājādhirāja* and the use of the *regnal* years, instead of the Gupta year, in their records. From the internal evidences of the epigraphs we can arrange the order of their succession. We have already seen that mahārājādhirāja Vainya Gupta had been ruling about the year 507 A.D. in the Vaṅga-Samataṭa region, and one Vijayasena is mentioned as a *dūtaka* in his Gunaighar record. In the seal attached to the Mallasarul inscription of Gopacandra of the year 3, we find the name of one mahārāja Vijayasena. If these two Vijayasenas may be regarded

[2] *Ep. Ind.* x. p. 50.

[3] Pargiter, *IA,* xxxix. pp 193-216; Bhattasali, *Ep. Ind*, xviii pp 74ff R D Banerjee thinks that the records are spurious (*JASB* NS vi pp 429f; vii pp 289f; x pp 425f), *ASIR,* 1907-8, p 256. The genuineness of the records is no longer doubted cf Pargiter, *JASB NS* vii p 499; *JRAS,* 1912, pp 710ff

as identical,[4] then it would appear that Gopacandra was the immediate successor of Vainya Gupta and hence we may place his accession about 510 A.D. He must have ruled for at least 18 years as shown by his Faridpur grant. Thus practically the whole of Gauda and Samataṭa countries has been under his sway. The *Ārya-mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa* mentions a king of the *prācya-jana-padas* named *Gopa,* who may be identified with Gopacandra.[5]

The Faridpur grant of Gopacandra refers to one *Jyestha-kāyastha* of the name of Nayasena, who is again mentioned in the grant of Dharmāditya. This shows that Dharmāditya was the immediate successor of mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra. Of the two Faridpur grants belonging to his reign the first one (A) is dated in his third regnal year.

The next king who ruled after Dharmāditya in the Vaṅga-Samatata country was mahārājādhirāja Samācāradeva and his Faridpur plate (D) is dated in his fourteenth regnal year. Two gold coins of this monarch are available, one of the *Rājalīlā* type discovered in the district of Jessore, and another of the *Archer type* of Gupta coins, having on the *Rev.* the legend *Narendra-vinata,* or *Narendrāditya.*[6]

There cannot be any doubt that this dynasty put an end to the rule of the Guptas in the Gauda and Vaṅga-Samatata regions. Whether Samācāradeva was the last king of the dynasty, or whether he had any successor is not known for certain.[7] In the present state of our knowledge it may tentatively be held that the dynasty lasted up to c 570 A.D.

We have given above the account of the dynasty as it is generally accepted by the scholars. Dr B C. Sen, who has made a very critical study of the records of the three kings, comes to a slightly different conclusion He thinks that the dynasty cannot have come to power before the end of Yaśodharman's reign.

[4] For the contrary view, *IC,* vi pp 106-7, cf Pargiter, i c

[5] *AMMK,* v. p. 760, as referred to in *Select Ins,* p 357, f n 1.

[6] Smith reads the legend Narendravinata (*IMC,* i. p 120, pl. xvi p 11) while Allan reads the same as Narendrāditya (*CGD,* p 149) cf *ASIR,* 1913-4, p 260

[7] For further discussions, *HB,* pp 53-4.

Further it is pointed out that "the Mallasarul copper plate which has a seal of mahārāja Vijayasena attached to itself appears to show that his sphere of activity was not unconnected with or far away from the Vardhamāna-*bhukti,* while there is no evidence to prove that mahārāja Vijayasena whose name occurs in the Gunaighar grant, had been in possession of the same area under a different master.[8] If we accept this view, then we can follow Pargiter's account of the kings Dharmāditya, Gopacandra and Samācāradeva as coming one after another, Gopacandra not being the earliest king of the dynasty. Nothing can be said definitely in the present state of our knowledge, though this much is certain that they put an end to the rule of the Guptas over a considerable portion of Bengal.

INVASION OF BHŪTIVARMAN

As already stated, the Gupta rule in North Bengal possibly came to an end under the pressure of the Kāmarūpa kings. The Badgaṅgā Rock inscription refers to Śrī Bhūtivarman, an ancestor of Bhāskaravarman, the contemporary of Harsa, as performing an Aśvamedha sacrifice. The record bears the date 234 or 244 G.E = 553 or 563 A.D.[9] The famous Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskaravarman[10] informs us that Bhūtivarman captured the whole of Kāmarūpa and had a circle of feudatory rulers under him. Kāmarūpa was bounded on the west of the river Karatoyā and included roughly the Brahmaputra valley, Rangpur, Cooch Behar and the adjoining regions.[11] As from North Bengal we find no records of the Imperial Guptas after 543 A.D., we may assume that the conquests of Bhūtivarman may have something to do with the fall of the dynasty in that region, though we must admit that there is no direct proof bearing on the fact.

While thus the Gupta empire was being attacked and dis-

[8] *SHAIB,* pp. 254f.

[9] Bhaṭṭasali reads the date as 234, (*JARS,* viii pp 138-9); D. C. Sircar reads the same as 244 (*JARS,* x pp. 64-7; *IHQ,* xx pp 143-5).

[10] *Ep Ind.* xii, 65-9; xix, pp 115f.

[11] *CAGI,* pp 572ff

membered from the east, the Maukharis and the Later Guptas evidently took up arms conjointly on behalf of their masters. The Haraha inscription of 554 A.D. informs us that the Maukhari Iśānavarman came to the throne "after conquering the lord of the Āndhras, who had thousands of threefold rutting elephants, after vanquishing in battle the Śūlikas, who had an army of countless galloping horses, and after causing the Gaudas to take shelter into the waters of the sea for the future [12]. From the nature of the description, it is clear that these victories were achieved by Iśānavarman before 554 A.D., while yet he was a crown prince, or in other words, during the life-time of his father Iśvaravarman the third mahārāja of the dynasty.

Now, while speaking of the third Later Gupta king, Jīvitagupta I, the Aphsad record states that this king's valour caused "terrible scorching fever (of fear)" to his great enemies, even though they lived in the cool sea-shores or in the Himalayan region Thus we find that during the time of Iśvaravarman, i.e, before 550 A.D., both the Maukharis and the Later Guptas had been fighting with the enemies living in the cool sea-shores, evidently against the dynasty of Gopacandra-Dharmāditya, and it was most likely a conjoint operation. In this connection we should also note the fact that while Jīvitagupta I fought against the enemies in the Himalayan regions, possibly against the Kāmarūpa king Bhūtivarman, no such claim is put forward on behalf of the Maukharis. The natural conclusion seems to be that the Maukharis and the Later Guptas first fought conjointly against the Bengal dynasty, but the Later Guptas went alone to fight against the Kāmarūpa enemies. Evidently taking advantage of the absence of his rival in a far off battlefield, the

[12] The exact significance of the expression *samudrāśraya* in the epigraph is not clear. R. G Basak thinks that Iśānavarman "made the Gauda people take shelter towards the sea-shore after causing their land territories to be deprived of their future prospects". (*HNI*, p. 111) Dr Raychaudhuri however, observes "Samudra may not refer to the sea-shore The passage in question implies that the Gauḍas were considered to have had a place of refuge in the sea itself, perhaps in an island, and not merely in the *velā, anūpa* or *kachchha*" (*HB*, p 37, n 3); for other interpretations, B P. Sinha, *DKM*, pp. 164ff.

Maukhari Iśānavarman overthrew the Gupta master of Magadha and himself assumed the title of mahārājādhirāja, as proved by the Haraha record of 554 A.D. The Later Guptas evidently took exception to such an immoral act of usurpation, and thus there ensued a keen contest between Iśānavarman on the one hand and the Later Guptas on the other. The Maukharis, however, proved bigger than their rivals, who had to acknowledge the overlordship of the former now becoming the mahārājādhirājas of the Āryāvarta.

APPENDIX I

THE KIDĀRA KUSĀNAS

It has already been shown that while the Shākas and the Shiladas ruled in the Punjab and possibly acknowledged the supremacy of Samudra Gupta the descendants of Great Kaniska maintained a precarious existence under the overlordship of the Sassanids of Iran.[1] In the later part of the fourth century A.D there was again a turmoil over the frontier region of India which at once changed the course of the history of the land. From the *Wei-shu* or the *Annals of the Wei Dynasty* we get some interesting informations about the episode. Thus it is stated · "The kingdom of the Ta-Yueh-chi has for its capital the town of Lou-kien-chi (Balkh) to the west of Fo-ti-cha (Bamian) at a distance of 14,500 li from Tai (the Wei capital). The Ta-Yueh-chi found themselves threatened on the north by the Juan-Juan, and were exposed on several occasions to their raids They, therefore, migrated to the west and established themselves in the town of Po-lo (Balkan), 2,100 li from Fo-ti-cha Their king Ki-to-lo (Kidāra), a brave and warlike prince, raised an army, crossed to the south of the Great Mountains (the Hindukush), and invaded Northern India, where the five kingdoms to the north of Kan-tho-lo (Gandhāra) submitted to him".[2]

From the above account it is clear that Kidāra was a member of the Great Yueh-chi family, and when he invaded India, the North-Western Frontier Province region was divided into five kingdoms. There are reasons to believe that the region was still under the Sassanid supremacy[3] and hence the five kingdoms may have been the five satrapies of the Iranian empire. The exact date of this invasion is still uncertain Cunningham thinks that Kidāra flourished about 425 A D.,[4] while Martin brings forth conclusive numismatic evidences to show that this

[1] *supra,* ch. vi

[2] Martin, *JRASB,* 1937, Num Suppl. 24.

[3] *supra,* ch. vi.

[4] Cunningham, *Later Indo-Scythians,* p 185

chief possibly ruled about 80 years earlier.[5] Ma-twan-lin, however, while speaking of the incident states that, "the capital of the Little Yueh-chi is the town of Fou-leou-cha (Peshawar). Their king was a son of Ki-to-lo; he was placed in charge of this town by his father when this prince was forced by the attacks of the Juan-Juan, to march westwards."[6] Here we should note the significant fact that Kidāra is described as belonging to the Little Yueh-chi group which stands in contrast to the account of the *Wei-shu*. The *Wei-shu*, however, makes this point clear when it states, "Kidāra, having been pursued by the Hiung-nu (Juan-Juan ?) and having retired to the west, ordered his son to establish himself in this town of Fou-leou-cha. These people are consequently called Little Yueh-chi". Thus it appears that Kidāra really belonged to the Ta-Yueh-chi group and the Chinese historians call him Little Yueh-chi, evidently wrongly, to distinguish him from other Yueh-chi kings.

Kidāra evidently started his career as a subordinate under the Sassanids, for on his earlier coins, his bust is represented as facing right, a convention which was followed by all the feudatories of the Sassanid empire. We have, again, other coins showing his bust facing left. This proves that he became independent. As pointed out by Martin, Ammiamus Marcellinus tells us that Shapur II was engaged in wars on his eastern borders from about 350-8 A D. and that his most important opponents were the Chionitae and Euseni.[7] Euseni has been recognised as a textual corruption for Cuseni or Kusāṇas. It is further stated that in 358 A.D., Shapur made peace with these tribes and picked up a quarrel with Rome. In 359 A.D, he invaded Mesopotamia and besieged the Roman fortress of Amida, and in this operation he was helped by contingents supplied by his former foes. . Thus it appears that in 358 A D. Kidāra became independent and occupied the region extending up to Gandhāra in the south. The Armenian historian Faustos of Byzantium refers on two occasions to the warfare between

[5] Martin, *l.c.*, pp 23ff.
[6] *ib*, p 25.
[7] *ib.*, p 30

the Kuṣāṇas and the Sassanids in 367-8 A.D.[8] Martin thinks that the Kuṣāṇas were the aggressors and inflicted a crushing defeat on the Sassanids in 367-8 A.D. It is not unlikely that the lead in this war was taken by Piro, the son of Kidāra, who by this time had come to the throne.[9] We have, however, certain coins of this monarch with the bust facing to the right showing that ultimately he lost his independence and had to acknowledge the supremacy of the Sassanid emperor Shapur III (383-8 A.D.). Dr. Altekar thinks that he was the Śaka king, who demanded from Rāma Gupta his wife Dhruvasvāminī, and at a later date may have been pressed from the east by Candra Gupta II. While Altekar's theory of Rāma Gupta has got yet to be proved, there is no direct evidence of any contact between Piro and Candra Gupta II.

Coins disclose the names of several Kusāṇa chiefs like Kṛtavīrya, Kuśala, Prakāśa, Sīlāditya etc. As the name Kidāra appears on these coins on the *obverse*, it is not unlikely that they were feudatory rulers under the Kuṣāṇa chief. The later history of the dynasty is obscure. The region under its sway passed under the White Huns and when the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang visited the country it was under the rule of a "Ksatriya king" who had his head-quarter at Kāpiśa.[10]

[8] Martin, l c, p. 32.
[9] *contra*, ib.
[10] Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, I. pp. 122ff.

APPENDIX II

A NOTE ON THE VĀKĀṬAKAS

The epigraphic texts invariably represent Vindhyaśakti I as the founder of the Vākāṭaka dynasty.[1] The Purāṇas state that Vindhyaśakti's son Pravarasena I had four sons and they became kings after their father's death This seems to indicate that there was a division of the empire after the death of Pravarasena. Inscriptions, however, testify to the division of Pravarasena's empire into two parts only, one under the descendants of his son Gautamīputra, who possibly predeceased his father, with headquarters in the Nagpur district, and another under Sarvasena and his successors with their capital at Vatsagulma in the Akola district.

The genealogy of the main branch (Nagpur) of the Vākātakas may be represented as follows:

1. Vindhyaśakti
   |
2. Pravarasena I
   - Gautamīputra
     |
     3. Rudrasena I
     |
     4. Pṛthivīsena I
     |
     5. Rudrasena II (married to Prabhāvatī Guptā, the daughter of the emperor Candra Gupta II)
        - 6. Divākarasena
        - 7. Dāmodarasena
        - 8. Pravarasena II
          |
          9. Narendrasena
          |
          10. Pṛthivīsena II
   - Sarvasena

[1] In the epigraphic record Vindhyaśakti is described as the 'vamśaketu' (*Hyderabad Archaeological series*, no 14 '*Vākātaka inscription* in Cave xvi at Ajantā' by V. V. Mirashi).

From the evidence of the epigraphic records the genealogy of the Vākātakas of Vatsagulma appears to be as follows:

1. Sarvasena, son of Pravarasena I, founder of the branch.
   |
2. Vindhyaśakti II
   |
3. Pravarasena II
   |
4. (Name unknown)
   |
5. Devasena
   |
6 Hariṣena

The chronology of both the branches of the Vākātakas is far from a settled one.[2] The date of Rudrasena II, the son-in-law of Candra Gupta II, must, however, fall within A.D 375-414 Rudrasena II ruled for a short period, which was followed by the regency of Prabhāvatī Guptā. We do not know when the next monarch Pravarasena II came to the throne. Dr Sircar thinks that as Prabhāvatī Guptā's death does not appear to have occurred long before the end of the rule of her aged brother Kumāra Gupta (A D. 414-55), the reign of Pravarasena II may be assigned to about the middle of the fifth century.[3] From the epigraphic records it appears that Pravarasena II must have ruled for at least 27 years and thus he may have been a contemporary of Skanda Gupta. His son Narendrasena was thus possibly a contemporary of Puru Gupta and thus may have conquered Mālava at the cost of his contemporary Gupta relative.[4]

Another Vākātaka monarch who made some conquests in North India was Hariṣeṇa, the last king of the Vatsagulma branch.[5] His date is also uncertain and some scholars assign

[2] For different views; *JRASB* (L), xii pp 1-5; 71-3, xiii pp 75-8, *IHQ*, xxiv. pp. 148-55; *JIH*, xiv. pp 1-26

[3] *The Classical Age*, p 181

[4] *supra*, p 212

[5] *supra*, p 228.

him to c 500 A.D on the ground that one of his inscriptions has been found at Ajanta while on architectural grounds, cave no. xvi of Ajanta is assigned to the same date by Fergusson and Burgess. It should be noted, however, that the date 500 A.D. is simply an approximate one, and it may be later by one or two decades. We are inclined to think that Hariṣeṇa flourished about 520 A D. and possibly conquered the Avanti region after the time of Pṛthivīsena II.

Some scholars believe that there was a struggle between Harisena and Pṛthivīsena II of the main branch. Epigraphic records no doubt claim that Pṛthivīsena twice retrieved the fallen fortunes of his family.[6] But this can hardly be taken to mean as referring to his struggle with Hariṣeṇa. Pṛthivīsena II may have inherited the Mālava region from his father Narendrasena and here he may have to fight with the Guptas. The Nalas also may have given him trouble. Budha Gupta may have recovered the Mālava region and it subsequently passed under the Epthalites. It was evidently after the eclipse of Mihirakula's power that Harisena conquered Avanti

[6] *Ep Ind* ix. p 267

APPENDIX III

THE EARLY MAUKHARIS

We have already seen that a Maukhari dynasty, subordinate under the Imperial Guptas, came to power in the sixth century A.D. The Maukharis were a very ancient clan, and a branch of them lived in the Gaya region as early as the second century B.C as proved by a clay seal inscribed in Mauryan Brāhmī script bearing the legend *Mokhalinam*, secured by General Cunningham at the place.[1] In the works of Bāṇa we find both the terms Mukhara and Maukhari[2] while the form Maukhara is found in the Jaunpur inscription[3] of king Iśvaravarman. In the Haraha inscription, mahārājādhirāja Iśānavarman is described as a Maukhari prince and as descended from the family of king Aśvapati of the house of Vaivasvata Manu.

K. P Jayaswal points out that "the modern Mauhari caste, almost solely located in the Gaya district, are their representatives. They are Baniyas, i.e., Vaiśyas now".[4] In fact, the Barābar and the Nagarjuni Hill Cave inscriptions, as we have already seen, disclose the existence of a sāmanta Maukhari family in the Gaya district sometimes before the rise of the dynasty to which Iśānavarman belonged.[5]

Another branch of the Maukhari, evidently lived in the Rajputana region, as known from the Badva Yupa inscriptions. A third branch of the clan, to which Iśānavarman belonged, evidently lived in the Barabanki, Fyzabad and Jaunpur in U.P. and in the epigraphic records mahārāja Harivarman is des-

[1] *Corpus* III, p. 14; supra, p 36

[2] In the *Harṣacarita*, Bāna considers *Mukhara* to be the progenitor of Grahavarman's line, *HC* Trans, p. 128, in the *Kādambarī*, we find the expression *'crowned Maukharis'*, Riddling, *Kādambarī*, 1

[3] *Corpus*, III, p 228

[4] Aravamuthan, *The Kāverī, Maukharis and the Saṅgam Age*, p 80,

[5] *supra*, pp. 245-6.

cribed as the founder of the dynasty. The Asirgadh and the Nalanda seals[6] give us the following genealogy:

1. Mahārāja Harivarman = Jayasvāminī
2. Mahārāja Ādityavarman = Harṣaguptā
3. Mahārāja Iśvaravarman = Upaguptā
4. Mahārājādhirāja Iśanavarman = Lakṣmīvatī
5. Mahārājādhirāja Sarvavarman = Indrabhaṭṭārikā
6. Mahārājādhirāja Avantivarman =
7. Mahārājādhirāja Su-

In the above account, it will be seen, that while the first three rulers are called mahārāja, the rest are given the loftier designation of mahārājādhirāja, showing thereby that the dynasty started as a subordinate one, evidently under the Imperial Guptas. Further, the name of Grahavarman, who was the brother-in-law of Harsa and also a mahārājādhirāja as proved by the accounts of Bāṇabhaṭṭa,[7] has been left out as he did not belong to the direct line of mahārājādhirāja Su- known from a Nalanda seal.

There are only two definite dates in the history of the Maukhari dynasty: 554 A.D., the date of the Haraha inscription of Iśānavarman, and 606 A.D., when Grahavarman was murdered by the wicked lord of Malwa. From the *Harsacarita* it appears that Grahavarman was the eldest son of Avantivarman and thus it may be presumed that he ruled before his brother mahārājādhirāja Su-. As Dr. Tripathi has aptly remarked, the Vikrama year 611 = 554 A D. mentioned in the Haraha record "is one of the starting points in the Maukhari chronology" while the other is 606 A.D. "when Grahavarman was killed". From this it has been concluded: "Hence assigning an average of twenty years to each of the six rulers, the seventh reign being extremely short, we feel justified in assuming that the Maukharis began their rule over Kanauj sometime about the close of the fifth century A D.".[8] We are, however, inclined to think that the dynasty began its career in the second decade of the sixth century A.D,

[6] *Corpus,* III. p. 219; *MASI,* no. 66.
[7] *infra,* Ch. ix.
[8] Tripathi, *HK,* p 60.,

say about 510 A D., when confusion ran high in the field of North Indian politics due to the inroads of the Epthalites or the White Huns.

About the kings ruling before Iśānavarman we have only vague references to the military campaigns carried on far and wide without any specific details. In the Haraha record Harivarman, the first king of the dynasty is given the epithet of Jvālāmukha, the exact significance of which, however, is not clear From the names of the queens of the second and third Maukhari rulers it appears that they married princesses of the Later Gupta family, since it is presumed that Harsaguptā, wife of mahārāja Ādityavarman, "was probably the sister of the Later Gupta king, Harsagupta, as it was a common practice in those days for brothers and sisters to bear such identical names, of course with variations of gender in the ending to indicate the sex".[9]

To the time of mahārāja Iśvaravarman belongs the fragmentary Jaunpur record, which, agrees in some details with the accounts of the Haraha inscription.[10]

Thus it appears that up to the time of Iśvaravarman the Maukharis and the Later Guptas had been living in peace and amity. When, however, Iśānavarman became the mahārājādhirāja, the Later Guptas turned to be their enemies and for some times there was a struggle between the two dynasties, but ulti-

[9] *ib*, p. 37

[10] Fleet observes that "it is impossible to say whether the historical information given in them refers to Iśānavarman or to one of his descendants". (*Corpus* III. p. 229) After paying a glowing tribute to Iśānavarman the record states that "a spark of fire that had come by the road from (the city of Dhārā) . the lord of the Andhras, wholly given over to fear took up his abode in the crevices of the Vindhya mountains ..... went to the Raivataka mountains among the warriors of the Andhra army who were spread out among the troops of elephants". Thus the Andhras with their elephants are mentioned in both the Jaunpur and the Haraha records and so it seems that both the epigraphs refer to one and the same event i e, the conquests of Iśānavarman made during the lifetime of his father. The "spark of fire that had come by the road from the city of Dhārā" probably refers to the Sulikas who lived in that direction, according to the evidences quoted above

mately the Later Guptas had to reconcile themselves to their fate and acknowledge the suzerainty of their relative, the Maukharis. In the *next* chapter it will be shown that a wrong notion prevails among the Indologists regarding the rivalry between the two families and it is assumed even that this rivalry ultimately led to the murder of Grahavarman and paved the way indirectly for the rise of Harṣa. The available facts, however, indicate that this rivalry was confined during the reign of Īśānavarman only.

APPENDIX IV

THE LATER GUPTAS

The Aphsad (near Gaya) inscription[1] gives the following genealogy of the early Later Gupta kings :

1. Kṛṣṇagupta
2. Harṣagupta
3. Jīvitagupta
4. Kumāragupta
5. Dāmodaragupta
6. Mahāsenagupta
7. Mādhavagupta
8. Ādityasena

There is much controversy regarding the early history of this dynasty. We have already tried to show[2] that (a) the original home of the Later Guptas was Magadha and not Mālava; (b) that they started their career about the time when the Maukharis also came to the forefront under mahārāja Harivarman; (c) that they were first subordinate under the Imperial Guptas, and later on, as we shall see in the next chapter, under the Maukharis; and (d) that the missing name of the monarch in the Damodarpur inscription of 543-4 A.D could not have contained the name of any early member of this dynasty. This is also borne out by the fact that Ādityasena the eighth ruler of the dynasty for the first time assumes the title of mahārājādhirāja, while the earlier members are given the epithets of *nrpa, ksitīśacudāmaṇi* etc. signifying subordinate status.

Krsṇagupta is described as rising to power after being victorious over countless enemies. Dr. Raychaudhuri is inclined to think that he fought against Yaśodharman[3] This, however, seems to be highly improbable inasmuch as Yaśodharman rose in the third decade of the sixth century A D, while Krsnagupta, possibly came to power about 510 A.D. and it is unlikely that he

[1] *Corpus,* III. no 42, pp 200-8
[2] *supra,* pp 244ff
[3] *PHAI,* p 601

could have lived till 532 A.D. specially when we find that the fourth king of the dynasty was a contemporary of Iśānavarman ruling in 554 A.D. We believe that Kṛṣṇagupta ruled from c. 510 to 525 A.D.

Harsagupta, the second king of the dynasty, is described as a valiant warrior who offered a great resistance in terrible battles to his enemies. He may have been the contemporary of Yaśodharman, though there is no evidence that he fought against the Mandasor monarch. His sister Harsaguptā may have been married to the second Maukhari king Ādityavarman.[4]

Jīvitagupta, the son of Harsagupta, is described as a terror to his enemies and as causing "terrible scorching fever (of fear)" to his great enemies though they lived on the cool sea-shores or in the Himalayan region. As we have already stated, the enemies on the cool sea-shore probably refer to the Gauḍas, where ruled the dynasty of Gopacandra, and this campaign was evidently undertaken conjointly with the Maukharis under the crown prince Īśānavarman.[5] It is not unlikely that as a result of this campaign the Later Guptas extended their sway over a portion of Bengal The Imperial Gupta suzerain was possibly still on the throne and the campaign may have been undertaken on his behalf. Up to this time the Maukharis and the Later Guptas lived in friendship, which later on turned into enmity.[6]

[4] *supra*, pp. 261-2

[5] *supra*, p. 249f.

[6] For the later history of the dynasty, after Jīvitagupta, *vide*, *in* Ch. viii.

CHAPTER VIII

THE AGE OF THE MAUKHARIS

I

THE MAUKHARI EMPIRE

ĪŚĀNAVARMAN

The Gupta dynasty came to an end in c. 551 A.D. and the next landmark in the history of North India, as already stated, is furnished by the Haraha inscription of 554 A.D. showing that the Maukhari Īśānavarman had become the mahārājādhirāja. Īśānavarman had to face stubborn opposition from the Later Gupta kings, though there is no reason to think that the struggle between the two dynasties was a long-continued one Some modern scholars refer to the following opinion of Cunningham as showing the antagonism between the two dynasties. The great Indologist observed : "As a curious proof of the antagonism between the Guptas and the Maukharis, I may cite the fact that on the coins of the Maukharis, king has his face turned to the left, in the opposite direction to that of the Gupta kings".[1] Cunningham made the remark as he worked under the impression that the Later Guptas were a branch of the Imperial Guptas, and, as the Nalanda seal of Visnu had then not been discovered, he included the Candrāditya and other coins in the issues of the Later Gupta monarchs That the theory does not hold good at present is apparent from the fact that in the Lucknow Museum we have a coin of the Maukhari Sarvavarman wherein the face of the king is really turned to the right, and further as we have but one coin of Dāmodaragupta, among the Later Gupta kings,[2] any definite inference can hardly be made from the same. The coin, however, has got a different significance which we shall discuss later on.

[1] Cunningham, *ASIR*, vol xvi p. 81; *JRAS*, 1906, pp. 849-50
[2] *ib*

As already stated, the Haraha inscription informs us that while yet a crown-prince Īśānavarman conquered the Āndhras, the Śūlikas and the Vangas From the nature of the description it appears that the epigraph only gives an account of the enemies conquered by the Maukhari lord at the different extremities of the empire The Āndhra king defeated by Iśānavarman may have been a member of the Visṇukundin family,[3] while the Vaṅgas seem to refer to the dynasty founded by mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra. The identification of the Śūlikas is far from certain.[4] In the *Purāṇas* the Śūlikas are described as living in the northern and the north-western division. Dr Raychaudhuri thinks that they *"were probably the Chālukyas"*, and adds the following note: "In the *Brihat-Saṃhitā*, ix. 15 ; xiv 8, the Śūlikas and Saulikas are associated with Aparāṇta (North Konkon), Vanavāsī (Kanara) and Vidarbha (Berar). In *Brih. Sam*, ix. 21, xx. 7, xiv 35, however, they are associated with Gandhāra and Vokkāna (Wakhan). A branch of the people may have dwelt in the north-west. In *JRAS*, 1912, 128 we have a reference to Kulastambha of the Śūlki family Tāranātha (*Ind Ant.* iv, 364) places the kingdom of 'Śūlik' beyond 'Togara' (Ter in the Deccan ?)".[5]

[3] Dr H C Raychaudhuri thinks that the Āndhra king was probably Mādhavavarman I of the Polamuru plates belonging to the Visnukuṇḍin family, who 'crossed the river Godāvarī with the desire to conquer the eastern region" and performed eleven horse sacrifices. (*PHAI*, p. 602); Sircar, *Suc Sat*, p 127: "This identification suits well the chronology we have adopted in these pages It may not be impossible that the eastern expedition of Mādhavavarman I was undertaken in retaliation to his previous unsuccessful struggle with the Maukharis This supposition is supported by the fact that a victory over the Āndhras is alluded to in the Jaunpur inscription of Iśvaravarman, father of Iśānavarman Maukhari". It is difficult to agree with Dr Sircar, for, as it has been shown in *Appendix* III supra, the Jaunpur record refers to the same incident as mentioned in the Haraha inscription Tripathi suggests that "the lord of the Andhras" may be either Indravarman or Vikramendravarman (*HK*, p 40)

[4] *VGA*, p 20

[5] Raychaudhuri, *PHAI*, p 602, f n 5 Pires, following Father Heras (*JAHRS*, I. pp 130-1), identifies the Śūlikas with Colas These scholars rely on the evidence of the Tamil work, *Kalingattupparani* by Jayagondān, which, according to Aravamuthan (*The Kāveri, Maukhari and the Sangam*

From the above note it is clear that the Śūlikas extended from the Central Asia to the Maharastra region. Dr. P. C. Bagchi has shown that *Śūlika* is the name of a special branch of the Paiśācī Prākṛit,[6] and hence it is clear that the tribes using the language occupied a very wide area. It is not unlikely that the Śūlikas mentioned in the Haraha record were such a tribe and occupied the North-Western region inasmuch as in verse 11 of the Aphsad record it is clearly hinted, as we shall see presently, that Iśānavarman defeated the Hūṇas as well. The Hūṇas occupied in the second half of the sixth century A.D. the region where the Paiśācī Prākrit had been in vogue, and thus, therefore, they may be identified with the Śūlikas of the Haraha record. This identification is indirectly supported by other considerations as well. The Haraha record, as already stated, gives evidently the names of the enemies of the Maukharis on the different frontiers of their kingdom. The Vaṅgas lived to the east, the Āndhras to the south and hence the other enemy, the Śūlikas, evidently lived to the west or north of the Maukhari dominion. Their identification with the Hūnas satisfies the required condition.

It is difficult to determine exactly how far the empire of Iśānavarman extended in the east. The Sirpur Stone inscription of Mahāśivagupta describes one Sūryavarman, as "born in the unblemished family of the Varmans great on account of their supremacy over Magadha". This Sūryavarman has been identified with the prince of the same name, the son of Īśānavarman as mentioned in the Haraha record.[7] This shows that Magadha

Age, p. 14f), narrates the circumstances which led to the victory of Karikāla over the Mukari, which has been identified with the Maukharis. It is supposed by Pires that Iśānavarman took revenge for this defeat. (*The Maukharis*, p. 80) The equation Mukari = Maukhari is hardly a tenable one As Tripathi points out Mukari was evidently the name of a place on the banks of the river Kāverī. (*HK*, p. 41, f n. 5). We cannot agree with Dr. Tripathi that Kīrtivarman I was defeated by Iśānavarman, for the evidence of the Mahākūta inscription can only be taken with some amount of reservation. (*infra*, p. 277).

[6] *JDL*, xxi. pp 1-10

[7] *Ep. Ind*, xi. pp. 185f. In *Ep Ind.*, xxiv, p. 283, A. Ghose observes: "Attempts have been made to identify this Sūryavarman with the king of that name mentioned in a Sirpur inscription, in which Sūryavarman figures

passed under the Maukharis possibly during the time of Īśānavarman, and thus evidently the Later Guptas were reduced to a subordinate position. The Later Guptas, however, tried to free themselves of the yoke of servitude, and thus the Aphsad inscription states that Kumāragupta, son of Jīvitagupta I, defeated Iśānavarman, and advanced as far as Prayāga, where he entered into fire, "kindled with dry cow-dung ashes". Evidently Kumāragupta died immediately after his victory against Iśānavarman, at the battlefield of Prayāga. Kumāragupta's son Dāmodaragupta came to the throne after this catastrophe and issued coins with his face turned to the right, in the opposite direction to that of the Maukhari kings as represented on the coins of the latter. This independence was, however, a very short one, for the Aphsad record states that the Later Gupta king "breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants belonging to the Maukhari, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūnas (in order to trample them to death), he became unconscious (and expired in the fight)" (*verse*, 11).[8]

The question now arises,—who was this Maukhari defeated by Dāmodaragupta? It is generally believed that as Dāmodaragupta was the fifth Later Gupta king, he was a contemporary of Sarvavarman, the fifth Maukhari ruler, since both the dynasties started about the same time[9] Dr. D. C Sircar, however, ob-

as a Varman king of Magadha and as the father-in-law of Harsagupta, the nephew of Mahāśiva Tivara of Southern Kośala But the Maukharis of the line of Harivarman are nowhere mentioned as a characteristically Magadhan dynasty, their capital being Kanauj. Moreover, a detailed palaeographical examination of the inscriptions of the Kośalān Pāndavas leads us to place Tivara at a date much later than A D 554 to which year the Haraha inscription belongs". For a criticism of this theory, see Sircar, *JRASBL*, xi p 72.

[8] Dr Basak rightly thinks that Dāmodaragupta was defeated in the battle (*HNI*, p 123). K C. Chattopadhyaya interprets the passage to mean that Dāmodaragupta fell in swoon but later on regained his consciousness (D R. Bhandarkar Volume, pp 181ff) Dr Sircar has controverted this interpretation, and, by quoting parallel passages from other Sanskrit works, has shown that the passage of the Aphsad record really refers to the death of Dāmodaragupta (*JRASBL*, xi p 70, f n)

[9] Tripathi, *HK*, pp 44f; Pires, *The Maukharis*, pp. 90f.

serves : "Apparently Īśānavarman, who is mentioned by name in v. 8 above (Aphsad inscription) has here (v. 11) been naturally referred to by his dynastic appellation. There is no reason to believe that Sarvavarman is here indicated. At least the suggestion does not appear to be quite in keeping with the spirit of the language of the record. The Maukharis possibly fought with the Hūnas as feudatories of Bālāditya of the Imperial Gupta family".[10] Dr Sircar's interpretation of v. 11 is really a commendable one, but we cannot accept his view regarding the Hūṇa-Maukhari struggle. The language of the verse clearly shows that the credit for defeating the Hūnas is ascribed to the Maukhari, *i.e.*, Īśānavarman, who could hardly have fought as a subordinate under Bālāditya who ruled before 532 A.D. The verse thus describes a double achievement for the Maukhari ruler, *first*, the defeat of Dāmodaragupta, and *secondly*, the defeat of the Hūnas or the Epthalites. (*cf*. the Śūlikas mentioned in the Haraha record as noted above). As a result of this victory, the Maukhari hold over Magadha became firm, and it continued at least for two more generations as proved by the evidence of the Deo-Baranark record

THE LATER EPTHALITES

The history of the Epthalites after Mihirakula is extremely obscure, excepting a few mere references here and there about them Dr Hirananda Śastrī's *Nalanda and its Epigraphic Materials* contains the account of two fragmentary seals giving the genealogy of a ruler, whose name is missing, and to which our attention has been drawn by Sri A Ghose in *IHQ*, vol. xix pp. 188-89, wherein we find the names of rulers who were known from the coins to have belonged to the Epthalite stock. The genealogy is as follows :

[10] *JRASBL*, xi p 70, f.n 4

Mahārāja Lavkhāṇa
|
(Mahārājādhirāja) name missing
m. Vittavvadevī
|
Mahārāja Jarīva
m Melyadevī
|
(Mahārājādhirāja) name missing
|
Name missing
(author of the seal)

It is really curious that while there are names of the mahārājas preserved in the epigraph, the names of the mahārājādhirājas are missing The designations show, at any rate, that the dynasty had been passing through very troublesome phase often losing its independent status. In any case, "the probable identity of Lavkhāṇa and Jarīva of the Nalanda seals with the Hūṇa Lakhāṇa and Jarī. .... of the coins cannot be overlooked especially as the palaeography of the seals and coins would indicate the same period for them" This seems to indicate that here we have probably the genealogy of the Hūna dynasty that ruled after Mihirakula. If, again, we consider the fact that Lahkhāṇa Narendrāditya of the *Rājataraṅginī* may be identified with the Lakkhāna Udayāditya of the coins, as suggested by Stein, and note the fact at the same time that Kalhana's narrative is often confusing before the history of the Kārkota dynasty, we may possibly hold that the dynasty in question may have been in existence in the period with which we are dealing here. In the second part of the sixth century, again, the Hūṇas had to court defeat at the hands of Iśānavarman and Prabhākaravardhana of Thānesvar and this tallies with the alternate designations of mahārājādhirāja and mahārāja attributed to the kings. If the above suggestion be correct, then we may assume that Iśānavarman defeated some member of the above dynasty [11]

[11] Iśānavarman issued some coins bearing dates the reading of which, however, is very uncertain Rapson says: "There is some doubt as to

SARVAVARMAN

As we have already seen, a son of Īśānavarman named Sūryavarman is mentioned in the Haraha record, but the Asirgadh and the Nalanda seals show that the Maukhari mahārājādhirāja was succeeded on the throne by Sarvavarman. Sūryavarman may have been a younger brother of Sarvavarman, or, if older, died during the life-time of his father. From the evidence of the Deo-Barnark inscription, it is clear that Sarvavarman maintained his hold over the Magadha region, or, in other words, he kept the Later Guptas under subordination. The Barah grant of Bhoja I Pratihāra shows that his sway extended over the Bundelkhand region. His seal found at Asirgadh may not have thus been carried to that place, as some scholars think, but may have been originally issued there. Thus we may agree with Aravamuthan that Asirgadh (Nimar Dist. M.P.) was a "Maukhari outpost in the Deccan".[12] The outpost was possibly created by Sarvavarman to keep a guard against the rising Cālukya power.[13]

the reading of these dates; and the era to which they should be referred is altogether doubtful". (*Indian Coins,* p 27) Rapson reads the dates, as 54,55; Burn as 4x; Brown as xx5; Cunningham as 55 or 185 or 257; and Smith as 54 *It is thus difficult to come to any definite conclusion from* these divergent readings Again, as some of the dates are in two figures and others in three "they must evidently refer to two distinct eras" (*HK,* p. 59). But as already stated no definite conclusion is possible on the matter. For the theory that all these dates should be referred to the Gupta era provided only in case of the dates with two digits, we should "supply the hundred's digit which is missing by the figure 2", see Pires *loc cit* pp 163ff

[12] Aravamuthan, The Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age, p 97

[13] The Nirmand (Kangra dist, Punjab) inscription speaks of a grant of mahārāja Sarvavarman (*Corpus,* iii. pp. 286-91), who has been identified by Aravamuthan (*loc cit* p 93) with the Maukhari king of the same name, on the ground that the latter "had been able to extend his dominions so far west in the course of his wars with the Hunas" As we have already stated, passage 11 of the Aphsad record shows that Īśānavarman and not Sarvavarman defeated the Hūṇas, and hence it is difficult to accept the identification suggested by Aravamuthan. For a discussion of the record *infra,* Ch ix; also *HK,* pp 54f

AVANTIVARMAN

The Nalanda seal shows that Sarvavarman was succeeded by his son mahārājādhirāja Avantivarman.[14] As his son Grahavarman, mentioned in the *Harṣacarita*, ruled for a very brief period only being murdered by the wicked lord of Malwa in c. 606 A D. (*infra*),[15] we may assume that Avantivarman ruled from c. 585 to c. 604 A D. His reign thus witnessed events of far-reaching importance which led to the dissolution of the Maukhari empire. First of all we should note the fact that he was evidently a contemporary of the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta, son of Dāmodaragupta, proved by the fact that Mahāsenagupta's sons were contemporaries of king Harsavardhana (606-647 A D.). Now, speaking of Mahāsenagupta, the Aphsad record states that the fame of the mighty king marked with honour of victory in the war over the illustrious Susthitavarman "is constantly sung on the banks of the river Lohitya".

Susthitavarman was evidently the king of Kāmarūpa and the father of Bhāskaravarman,[16] the ally of Harsa. It has already been shown that the dynasty was rising in importance and Mahābhūtivarman or Śrī Bhūtivarman performed a horse-sacrifice and possibly put an end to the rule of the Imperial Guptas in North Bengal. Bhūtivarman's grandson, Sthitavarman, is described in the Nalanda seals as the performer of two horse-sacrifices, while the latter's son, Susthitavarman takes the title of mahārājādhirāja. He was defeated by the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta, as stated above, and there is possibly also

[14] *Ep. Ind*, xxiv. p. 283.

[15] Dr R. C Majumdar, however, thinks "it is very doubtful whether Grahavarman ever sat on the Maukhari throne". (*HB*, p 65). The account of Bāna, as we shall see later on, clearly indicates, however, that Grahavarman was a king and at the time of his marriage with Rājyaśrī his father Avantivarman was dead.. *infra*.

[16] Dr R K. Mookerjee thinks that Susthitavarman was a Maukhari king. (Harsa, p. 25, f n. 1) R D Banerjee proved that the view is wrong and that Susthitavarman was a Kāmarūpa monarch (*JBORS*, xiv p. 255) Though Dr Mookerjee challenged the view (*JBORS*, xv pp 252ff), scholars now generally think that Susthitavarman is identical with the Kāmarūpa king of the same name, the father of Bhāskaravarman.

a hint of it in the Nidhanpur record which states that Susthitavarman *"gave away the goddess of royal fortune, like the earth to supplicants"*. (v. 19).

We have now to discuss two questions—*first*, if Mahāsenagupta extended his power from Magadha to Kāmarūpa, why did he not adopt the title of mahārājādhirāja? and, *secondly*, who was ruling at this time in the Vanga-Samatata region, for Mahāsenagupta must have passed through this territory while marching against the king of Kāmarūpa?

It has been shown that the Later Guptas became subordinate rulers under the Maukharis, though during the reign of Iśānavarman they made two futile attempts to make themselves free and independent. In the time of Sarvavarman, we find that the Later Guptas created no trouble, or, in other words, there was now friendship between the two dynasties which characterised their relationship in the earlier period. The fact that Mahāsenagupta's sons lived in the court of Thānesvar at a later period, and the Thānesvar king at the same time entered into a matrimonial relationship with Avantivarman's son Grahavarman (*infra*), also points to the same fact. Thus Mahāsenagupta evidently carried the conquest up to the river Lauhitya, on behalf of his suzerain Avantivarman, and this can only explain why the Later Gupta king has not been adorned with the title of mahārājādhirāja in the epigraphic record.[17]

It is difficult to determine who was the reigning monarch of the Vaṅga-Samatata region about this time. We have already seen that a new dynasty came into existence in this region about

[17] The Madhuvan grant (*Ep Ind.* i. pp 72f) and the Sonpat seal (*Corpus*, iii. 232) of Harsa speaks of Mahāsenaguptādevī as the mother of Prabhākaravardhan, father of Harsa Mahāsenaguptādevī was evidently a sister of the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta, and from this it has been inferred that "the Pushyabhuti alliance of Mahāsenagupta was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukharis. The policy was eminently successful, and during his reign we do not hear of any struggle with that family" (*PHAI*, pp 606-7). This theory is evidently based on the notion that there was a long-continued rivalry between the Maukharis and the Later Guptas As we have tried to show, the fact was otherwise, the struggle being confined only to the reign of Iśānavarman

510 A D., and as it consisted of three kings at least—Gopacandra, Dharmāditya and Samācāradeva—the dynasty possibly continued up to c. 570 A.D.[18]

JAYANĀGA

The Vappaghosavata inscription, written in characters of the upright Gupta types of the latter half of the sixth century A.D., discloses the existence of a king named Jayanāga bearing the epithets mahārājādhirāja and paramabhāgavata.[19] The seal of the plate bears an effigy of the goddess Laksmī with two elephants on her two sides making the pūrṇābhiseka. To him may be attributed the coins bearing the abbreviated name of *Jaya* on the *obv.* and a seated Laksmī with an elephant sprinkling water on her on the *rev.*[20] The inscription was issued during the king's stay at Karṇasuvarṇa, when Nārāyaṇabhadra, a sāmanta under him, was carrying on the administration of the Audumbārika visaya, identified with the greater part of Birbhum and a part of Murshidabad district. In the *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-kalpa,* we get possibly a confused reference to this monarch. While he is placed in one place after Śaśāṅka, the Tibetan version of the text speaks of Jaya (the great serpent = Nāga) followed by Keśarī "who in his turn was followed by Śaśāṅka (Somākhya)".[21] The palaeographical evidence of the Vappaghosavata record is strongly in favour of placing the king in the latter part of the sixth century A.D.[22]

It is not known exactly whether Jayanāga's authority

[18] *supra,* pp. 250-1.

[19] *Ep. Ind.,* xviii. pp. 60ff; xix pp. 286ff.

[20] Allan, *loc. cit,* lxi, civ. pp 150-1. Allan restores the name on the coin as Jaya-gupta cf *DKM,* p. 222.

[21] *AMMK* ed Jayaswal, pp 61, 66. Jayaswal reads Nagarāja in place of Nāgarāja and considers the former to be a member of the Bhāraśiva dynasty (*loc cit.,* p. 51).

[22] In *HB,* pp. 79f, Jayanāga is placed after Śaśāṅka. As we shall see later on, sometimes after the death of Śaśāṅka, Bihar and Bengal was partitioned by Harṣa and Bhāskaravarman, and thus there appears to be no place for a mahārājādhirāja having sway over Karnasuvarṇa *infra, SHAIB,* pp 256-7.

extended over any portion of the Eastern Bengal, but this much appears to be certain that as a result of Mahāsenagupta's conquest his empire came to an end. Thus under Avantivarman, the Maukhari empire reached at its height. But it was during his reign also that North India was attacked from different directions, which brought a chaos ultimately reducing the Maukharis to a petty local dynasty.

TIBETAN INVASION

Sometime between 581 and 600 A.D., the different hill tribes of Tibet were united under Tsrong-tsang who led a victorious campaign to Central India, a term used by the Chinese and the Tibetans to denote the U.P. and Bihar.[23] The Tibetan invasion possibly came through the Nepal route,[24] for we find that about this time there were some political changes in that country also paving the way for the rise of Aṃśuvarman, whose daughter was married to the son of the Tibetan monarch. Ma-twan-lin says that at the time of Tsrong-tsang's death c. 620 A.D., his kingdom extended to the borders of India (*Petech*). This shows that Tsrong-tsang simply led predatory raids in Central India leading to no permanent conquests.[25]

KALACURI INVASION

The Kalacuris led another invasion from the south-western direction and in the year 595 A.D. Ujjayinī passed under the possession of the Kalacuri king Śamkaragaṇa. It has been inferred that the term Kalacuri is derived from the Turkish word Kulucur meaning an office of high rank, and that the Kalacuris were originally a foreign tribe that entered India at the time of the Epthalite invasion.[26] Possibly when Toramāna and his son Mihirakula occupied the Gwalior region, the tribe entered into their service and settled in the Anūpa country.

[23] *HB*, pp. 91-3; *JGIS*, iii (1941), p. 92.
[24] For an account of the Nepal route, Bagchi, *India and China*, p. 21.
[25] Petech, *The Chronicles of Ladakh*, pp. 30-39
[26] *PIHC*, 1943, p. 44

Later on, when they were Indianised, they claimed descent from the Haihaya king Arjuna, son of Kṛtavīrya, the traditional hero and ruler of the Māhiṣmatī region, as proved by the preambles of their records. From the epigraphic texts, we learn the existence of three Kalacuri kings, Kṛṣṇarāja, his son Śaṃkaragaṇa and the latter's son Buddharāja. The Abhona record of Śaṃkaragaṇa was issued from the king's victorious camp at Ujjayinī in 595 A.D., showing that the Western Malwa had been conquered possibly in that year by the Kalacuris.[27] This conquest evidently produced a turmoil in the Avanti region, where, the Later Guptas, disturbed by the Tibetan invasion, carved out a principality of their own.

Some scholars think that about this time the eastern part of North India was invaded by the Cālukya king Kīrtivarman I. According to the Mahākūṭa Pillar inscription, Kīrtivarman I defeated the kings of Vaṅga, Aṅga, Kaliṅga, Vattura, Magadha, Madraka, Kerala, Gaṅga, Musaka, Pāṇḍya, Dramila, Coliya, Āluka and Vaijayantī.[28] As Kīrtivarman's reign came to an end in 597-8 A.D., it has been presumed that he possibly made the conquests of Vaṅga, Anga, Magadha etc. in the last quarter of the sixth century A.D.[29] Dr. Tripathi interprets the account in a different way, stating that "probably in their northward progress they (the Cālukyas) came into conflict with Iśānavarman, and suffered a defeat at his hands".[30] It appears to be unnecessary to build any hypothesis on the evidence of the Mahākūṭa inscription, for we find that in the Aihole inscription of his son Kīrtivarman is credited with the conquest of the Nalas, Mauryas and Kadambas only, proving that the account of the Mahākūṭa inscription is an exaggerated one.

[27] For the Kalacuris, *AHD*, p. 82; *The Classical Age*, pp. 194ff
[28] *IA*, xix p 7.
[29] *HB*, p. 54
[30] Tripathi, *HK*, p 42.

II

ON THE EVE OF HARSA'S RISE

ŚAŚĀṄKA

The invasions of North India from different directions, as already stated, brought a tremendous change in the political condition of the land. In Eastern India, there arose a new power in the person of Śaśānka whose existence is disclosed to us by a number of epigraphic records, the *Harsacarita,* the *Si-yu-ki* and the *She-kia-fang-che.* From the seal-matrix cut in the rock of the hill-fort of Rhotasgarh bearing the legend *'Śrī-mahāsāmanta Śaśāṅkadevasya',* i.e., 'of the illustrious great vassal Śaśānka',[31] it has generally been inferred that Saśāṅka began his life as a subordinate ruler possibly under Avantivarman or Mahāsenagupta.[32] But as the *She-kia-fang-che* states explicitly that Śaśānka was defeated by Harṣa, the history of this monarch needs to be entirely rewritten, and it is not unlikely that the Rhotasgarh seal-matrix was executed when Śaśāṅka became a subordinate ruler under the great Vardhana emperor.

Till lately, we knew only one other inscription, the Ganjam C.P. of 619 A.D., in which mahāsāmanta Sainyabhīta Mādhavavarman of the Śailodbhava dynasty, associated with the Koṅgoda-*maṇḍala,* acknowledges the supremacy of mahārājādhirāja Śrī-Saśāṅka.[33] But fortunately we are now in possession of three more plates throwing fresh light on his reign, and they need a critical study. These plates are:

[31] *Corpus,* iii. p. 284.

[32] *IHQ,* xii. p 457; *HB,* p. 59; *DKM,* pp. 222-3. R. D. Banerjee thinks that Śaśaṅka belonged to the Later Gupta dynasty of Magadha (*History of Orissa,* i. p. 129), while it has been pointed out (*Ep. Ind.,* i. p. 70) that one of the manuscripts of *Harṣacarita* names the king of Gauḍa as Narendragupta. The fact that Śaśaṅka has always been described as a Gauḍa or 'vile Gauḍa' in the *Harṣacarita* shows that his original home was in Bengal, while there is no evidence to prove that the line of Kṛṣṇagupta also belonged originally to that province. For some other theories which, however, appear to be untenable, see, *JARS,* ii p. 12; *JAHRS,* x. pp 1ff.

[33] *Ep. Ind.,* vi. p. 141.

(a) the Doobi C. P. of Bhāskaravarman, ed. P. D. Chaudhury in *JARS*, vol. xii, pp. 16-33, and D. C. Sircar, *IHQ*, vol. xxvi, pp. 241-6.
(b) two C.P.s of Śaśāṅka from Midnapur, ed. R. C. Majumdar, *JRASB*, Letters, vol. xi pp. 1-9.

The Doobi records inform us that Supratiṣṭhitavarman and Bhāskaravarman, the sons of the Kāmarūpa king Susthitavarman, who according to the Aphsad inscription was defeated by the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta (*supra*), had to face an invasion by a Gauda monarch, and "in spite of their brave resistance, alas, the two brothers were completely covered with the striking arms of the enemies, and that, when as a result of that both of them fell into swoon, they were encircled by the fierce elephants of the Gauḍa army and were captured by the enemies".[34] From the account we may infer further that "they had been carried away as prisoners by the Gauda army and that after some time the Gauda king re-instated them in the rule of Kāmarūpa as his subordinate allies".[35]

The question now arises, who was the Gauda king? P. D. Chaudhury thinks that "this invading army belonged to Mahāsenagupta". Dr. D. C. Sircar observes: "The king of Gauda who led or sent the expedition against Kāmarūpa after Susthitavarman's death may have been Śaśāṅka himself (who is known to have been on the throne in 605-6 A.D.) or Śaśāṅka's immediate predecessor on the throne of Karṇasuvarṇa".[36]

Bhāskaravarman, as we shall see later on, outlived Harsa who died in 647 A.D. and entered into an alliance with the Vardhana monarch in 606 A.D. As he thus ruled for more than 40 years, he may have been a man of quite tender age when Śaśāṅka came to power sometime before 606 A.D. As we have already said the Tibetan invasion under Tsrong-tsang after 581 A.D., paved the way for the rise of Śaśāṅka, and had Bhāskaravarman been in power about this time, say c. 590 A.D., then we have to

[34] *IHQ*, xxvi. p 245
[35] *ib.*
[36] *ib*, p 246.

assume that he ruled for nearly 60 years, which though not impossible is not always probable. Again, had Mahāsenagupta captured the Kāmarūpa princes, we may expect that this would have been mentioned in the Aphsad inscription which only speaks of his exploits against their father, Susthitavarman. The silence of the record over this affair speaks for itself. Further, the Doobi records state that the invader was a Gauda monarch, while Mahāsenagupta has never been described as such in any of the records. This leads to the only conclusion that the invader was Śaśāṅka, and this explains further why Bhāskaravarman entered into an alliance with Harsa in 606 A.D., when the latter was on his march against the Gauda king. (*infra*).

While editing the two Midnapore plates, Dr. Majumdar remarked that the dates of both are uncertain, and in Pl no. i "we may provisionally read the year as 309 or 19. In the former case, it has to be referred to the Gupta era and the date would be equivalent to 629 A.D. But the latter is more probable and we may regard the record as dated in the 19th year".[37] As regards Pl. no. ii, he says: "In spite of all appearances to the contrary, we may therefore, provisionally read the whole as *samvat* 8",[38] and on the strength of this assumption the conquest of the southern region (Midnapore, Orissa etc.) is placed between 580 and 605 A.D. Now in both the plates, Śaśāṅka is described as: "*Sri-Śaśāṅka mahīm = pāti catur-jjaladhi-mekhalām*" i e., "while the illustrious Śaśāṅka is protecting the earth,—whose girdle is formed by the four oceans". We may note here the fact that while in the Ganjam C. P. of 619 A D., Śaśāṅka is described as mahārājādhirāja, in the above plates he is given the simple honorific of Śrī, which is usually a subordinate designation. Can we infer from it that the plates were issued after Śaśāṅka became a subordinate ruler under Harsa (*infra* ch. ix), or, is it a case of scribe's negligence? If we accept the first alternative, which appears to be more probable, then we would prefer the date 629 A.D., because, as we shall see later on, Harṣa possibly reduced Śaśāṅka under submission sometime between

[37] *JRASBL*, xi. p 3
[38] *ib*

618 and 626 A.D. The plates, at any rate, show that Śaśāṅka's suzerainty extended over the Utkala-deśa.

The above two plates combined with the Ganjam record prove that Śaśāṅka's sway extended in the south as far as Ganjam. The Doobi plates, on the other hand, show that at least for sometime the kingdom of Kāmarūpa was a tributary under him.

The *Si-yu-ki* has preserved an account of this king which shows that he was a devout Śaiva, an anti-Buddhist and that his authority extended over Bihar as well. The account runs thus:

> "In recent times king Śaśāṅka having tried in vain to efface the footprints (of Lord Buddha at the old relic-tope at Pātaliputra) caused the stone to be thrown into the Ganges, but it returned to its original place".[39]
>
> "In recent times, Śaśāṅka, the enemy and oppressor of Buddhism, cut down the Bodhi-Tree, destroyed its roots down to the water, and burned what had remained", and further he made an abortive attempt "to have the image (of Lord Buddha at Bodh-Gaya) removed and replaced by one of Śiva. Again, while giving an account of Kuśīnagara, it is stated 'by Śaśānka's extermination of Buddhism the groups of brethren were all broken up to the great distress of Brāhmin' ".[40]

Thus Śaśāṅka's authority extended practically over the whole of the province of Bihar. Dr. R. C. Majumdar says that "there is hardly any doubt that both Northern and Western Bengal were included in the dominions of Śaśāṅka".[41] Tradition connects his name with a place in the Bogra district.[42] In the *Harsacarita*, Śaśāṅka has been described as *'vile-Gauda'*, while according to the *Trikāṇḍaśesa*, "Varendri and Gauda were integral portions of Pundravardhana".[43] This may be taken as an indirect proof of Śaśāṅka's hold over North Bengal.

[39] Watters, *loc. cit.*, ii. p 92
[40] *ib*, pp. 115, 116, 43
[41] *HB*, p 60
[42] Ettinghausen, *Harṣvardhana*, p 42, fn. 2
[43] *SHAIB*, p. 110.

But this leads to another question. If Gauda may be identified with the present districts of North Bengal, and, as in the *Harsacarita,* Śaśāṅka is invariably called the *'vile-Gauda',* can we infer that North Bengal was the original home of Śaśāṅka, and that from this base he extended his power in different directions, and later on made Karnasuvarṇa, identified with the present Rangamati, in the Murshidabad district of West Bengal, his capital? This goes against the theory of those who assign the Rhotasgarh seal to the early period of Śaśāṅka's career and think that he was originally a subordinate ruler in Bihar.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar is not inclined to think that Śaśāṅka was anti-Buddhist. Thus he says: "But how far the acts of oppression, charged by Hiuen Tsang against Śaśāṅka, can be regarded as historically true, it is difficult to say. At present it rests upon the sole evidence of the Buddhist writers who cannot, by any means, be regarded as unbiased or unprejudiced, at least in any matter which either concerned Śaśāṅka or adversely affected Buddhism".[44]

PRABHĀKARAVARDHANA

While thus as a result of the foreign inroads, Śaśāṅka was coming to the forefront in Eastern India, in the west the house of Thāneśvara was coming to prominence. This is clearly proved by the fact that while in the inscriptions, Prabhākaravardhana, the father of Harsa, is given the title of mahārājādhirāja, the latter's ancestors are given the simpler designation of mahārāja.[45] In the *Harsacarita* also, Bāṇa after giving an account of Puspabhūti, the founder of the dynasty, begins his narrative with Prabhākaravardhana, ignoring his predecessors altogether, pointing clearly to the fact that he was the first really important member of the house.[46] For Prabhākaravardhana's achievements our

[44] *HB,* p. 67.

[45] Banskhera Copper plate of the year 22 or 628 A.D. (*Ep. Ind.* iv. pp 208-11); Madhuvan Copper plate of the year 25 or 631 A.D. (*Ep. Ind.* i. pp. 67-75); Sonpat seal (*Corpus,* iii. pp. 231-2); Nālandā seal (*Ep. Ind.* xxi. pp. 74-6).

[46] *HC, Trans.,* pp. 83ff; 101ff.

only source is the work of Bāṇa, and it is really curious that scholars have implicitly followed the account, without ascertaining its real historical value, even taking the court-scenes, coming of messengers etc., as facts of sober history.[47] In *verse* 18 of his *Introduction,* Bāṇa says : "The mighty deeds of my great king, which fill my heart, though remembered only, restrain my tongue and forbid it to proceed to the poet's task".[48] Thus Bāṇa wrote his work from his memory and hence it cannot be regarded as solely authentic. Indeed, "historically we may say that the work is of minimal value, though in our paucity of actual records, it is something even to have this".[49] Further, "the gorgeously descriptive and ornamental style leaves little room for the poor thread of actual history".[50] So we must proceed cautiously.

Regarding Prabhākaravardhana, the work states that he was "a lion to the Hūna deer, a burning fever to the king of the Indus land, a trouble to the sleep of the Gurjaras, a bilious plague to the lord of Gandhāra, a looter to the lawlessness of the Lātas, and an axe to the creeper of Mālwa's glory".[51] This can hardly mean that Prabhākaravardhana actually conquered all these states ; on the contrary, the very nature of the description clearly indicates that he was on hostile terms with them.[52] The above passage, however, is interesting as it throws light on the political condition of western and north-western India on the eve of Harsa's rise.

What, however, creates some confusion in the above narrative is the separate mention of Sindhu-deśa (the Indus land) and Gandhāra. Some scholars take Sindhu-deśa to mean the present Sind, but the case seems to be otherwise. As Dr. Raychaudhuri has pointed out : "Yuan Chwang went east from Sin-tu above

[47] Mookerjee, *Harṣa,* Ch. i
[48] *cf. HC, Trans.,* p. 3.
[49] Keith, *HSL,* p. 318.
[50] *cf. ib.,* pp. 326ff.
[51] *HC. Trans.,* p. 101.
[52] C. V. Vaidya thinks that these states were conquered and annexed by Prabhākaravardhana (*HMHI,* i. pp. 1ff) ; see also, Mookerjee, *Harṣa,* p 11).

900 li and crossing to the east bank of the Indus came to the Mou-lo-shan-pu-lu country. This proves that Sin-tu lay to the west of Mou-lo-shan-pu-lu (Multan), and was situated on the west side of the Indus. The commentator of the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana makes the clear statement '*Saindhavānāmiti, Sindhu-nāmā nadastasya paścimena Sindhudeśastatra bhavānām*' ".[53] This clearly shows that to the west of Multan, on the other side of the Indus, there were two states with which Prabhākaravardhana came into hostile contact. Yuan Chwang in his *Si-yu-ki* states, however, that the region extending from Gandhāra to Kāpiśa (mod. Ghorband and Panjshir in E. Afghanistan) in the west was under the rule of a ksatriya prince whose "power extended over more than ten of the neighbouring lands".[54] Besides Gandhāra (mod. Peshawar, Charsadda and Und) and Kāpiśa, the other districts of this kingdom were Lan-po (mod. Laghman), Na-ka-lo-ho or Nagar (mod. Jelalabad and the valley of the Kabul river) and Fa-la-na or Barana (mod. Bannu). Thus there was only one kingdom to the north-western side of the Indus when the Chinese traveller visited the land in 629 A.D. What then is the significance of the statement of Bānabhatta? We have already seen that the White Hūṇs or the Epthalites over-ran the North-Western Frontier Province, and about the beginning of the sixth century A.D, they set up an independent kingdom in Gandhāra. Bāṇa possibly refers to this Epthalite Gandhāra kingdom and to the kingdom of the Kusaṇas (*Sindhu-deśa*) in the above passage, and this narrative combined with the statements of the Chinese traveller merely shows that sometime after the period of Prabhākaravardhana but before 629 A.D., the Epthalite kingdom had passed under the rule of the Kusāṇas of Kāpiśa. The *Si-yu-ki* also states that in Kan-to-lo or Gandhāra: "The royal family was extinct and the country was subject to Kāpiśa".[55]

[53] *PHAI*, p 620
[54] Watters, *loc cit*, i. p 123.
[55] *ib*, p 199.

LATER GUPTAS AND MAUKHARIS

Thus the house of Thāneśvara was coming into prominence. But where were now the Later Guptas and the Maukharis who played such important parts in the age just preceeding? Bāṇabhatta informs us that a messenger came from Grahavarman, the eldest son of Avantivarman, seeking the hand of the princess Rājyaśrī, the only daughter of Prabhākaravardhana, born c. 593 A D.,[56] and the marriage ultimately took place at Thāneśvara[57] Whether really any such messenger came or not, "the manner in which Bāna has described the settlement and actual celebration of the marriage, performed at Thāneśvara between Avantivarman's son Grahavarman, and Prabhākaravardhana's daughter Rājyaśrī, clearly indicates that the bridegroom's father was not alive at the time of his son's wedding, and therefore Grahavarman himself sought the hand of the Vardhana princess, through an ambassador, and the marriage-party arrived at the bride's father's court without any guardian to look after the affairs".[58] The Maukharis were now a declining power, they had lost the eastern part of their empire under the pressure of the foreign invasions and the rise of Śaśāṅka, and hence they naturally wanted an alliance with the rising power of Thāneśvara. About the fate of the Later Guptas, there is some confusion in the available sources. As we have already seen, they were ruling in Magadha and the neighbouring regions, and the rise of Śaśānka clearly demonstrates the fact that they were no more there, for the older theory that Śaśāṅka began his career as a subordinate ruler holds no more good as we have already stated Now, the *Harsacarita* gives us the following details :

(i) that Mādhavagupta and Kumāragupta, the two sons of the king of Mālava, were living in the court of Thāneśvara,[53]

[56] Mookerjee, *Harsa*, pp 12, 69
[57] *HC. Trans*, p 122
[58] Basak, *HNI*, pp 117-8; *contra*. Tripathi, *HK.*, p 50.
[59] *HC.* Trans, p 119

(ii) that Prabhākaravardhana was an axe to the creeper of Mālava's glory,[60]

(iii) that on the very day king Prabhākaravardhana died, the *"wicked lord of Mālava"* attacked and killed Grahavarman, threw Rājyaśrī into the prison at Kānyakubja, and planned to invade Thāneśvara itself.[61]

If we identify Mādhavagupta, mentioned above, with the son of Mahāsenagupta of the same name as mentioned in the Aphsad inscription, then the history of the Later Guptas at this period may be summed up as follows:

As a result of the inroads from outside, Mahāsenagupta left Magadha and carved a kingdom for himself in the Eastern Malwa region, for as the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary on the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana informs us, the simple mention of Mālava, without any distinguishing epithet, denotes Eastern Malwa only, while the term Apara-Mālava denotes Ujjayinī.[62] Mahāsenagupta died a little after, leaving two sons, Mādhavagupta and Kumāragupta. Harsa's inscriptions show that Mahāsenaguptā, evidently a sister of Mahāsenagupta, was the mother of Prabhākaravardhana, and it is in this light that we should interpret the later history of the dynasty. What then can be meant by the account of Bāṇa that the sons of Mahāsengupta were living in the court of Thāneś-vara, and at the same time Prabhākaravardhana was in enmity with the kingdom of Malwa? Evidently, after the death of Mahā-senagupta, the Mālava kingdom passed in the hand of an usurper, and the rightful claimants to the throne took shelter in the court of Thāneśvara Prabhākaravardhana took up the cause of his cousins and harassed the usurper, who, as soon as the former died, attacked and killed his son-in-law, Grahavarman, and planned to invade Thāneśvara itself.

It is difficult to determine in the present state of our knowledge how Mahāsenagupta's reign came to an end, leaving the two princes in their tragic fate. Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks

[60] *ib*, p 101.
[61] *ib*, p 173
[62] Tripathi, *HK*, p 46 & f n. 2

that as the Maitraka king Śīlāditya I of Valabhī conquered a considerable portion of Western Malwa, and the Kalacuri king Śaṇkaragaṇa was also in possession of Ujjayinī, it may be inferred that thus pressed by two powerful enemies Mahāsenagupta lost his hold over Mālava.[63] The whole theory hinges on the fact, how should we interpret the word Mālava Shall we take it in the sense of Eastern Malwa only or the whole of the Malwa country including Ujjayinī as Dr. D C. Ganguly does? Dr. Ganguly refers to the evidences of the Aihole inscription, a Valabhī record of 639 A.D., the Nilgund inscription and the Baroda plates of Karkarāja of 812 A.D. where the term Mālava has been used in a wider sense to include Apara-Mālava as well.[64] On the Later Guptas, Dr. Ganguly's thesis is as follows:

(i) Mālava was the original home of the Later Guptas,

(ii) Sometimes during the early part of his reign, Mahāsenagupta had to suffer a terrible disaster in the hand of Kalacuri Śaṅkaragaṇa, son of Krsṇaraja. "Mahāsenagupta appears to have been killed in the battle, after which his two sons, Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, fled to Thāneśvara and took shelter under their relation Prabhākaravardhana of Thāneśvara".

(iii) Buddharāja, son of Śaṅkaragana, is the *"wicked lord of Malwa"*, referred to in the *Harsacarita,* who killed Grahavarman.

It has already been shown that Magadha and not Mālava was the original home of the Later Guptas[65] Again, the wicked lord of Malwa appears to have been Devagupta who is mentioned in the Madhuban and the Banskhara inscriptions of Harsa as receiving punishment at the hands of Rājyavardhana As Dr. Raychaudhuri says if Buddharāja had been the murderer of Grahavarman, "then it is rather surprising that a shadowy figure like Devagupta, and not Buddharāja, would be specially selected in the epigraphic records of the time of Harsha, for

[63] Majumdar, *The Classical Age,* p 74

[64] *JBORS,* xix. pp 399-400

[65] *supra,* pp. 244ff.

prominent notice among 'the kings who resembled wicked horses' ".[66] It is thus quite probable that while Mahāsenagupta migrated to and carved the kingdom for himself in Eastern Malwa, the western part of the country had been under the Kalacuris. There is absolutely no evidence of a struggle between the Kalacuris and the Later Guptas in this age.

As regards the Maitraka king Śīlāditya I of Valabhī, it may be stated that he could not have occupied the Western Malwa region before 609 A.D., for the Saisavani plate of that date shows clearly that Śaṅkaragaṇa's son Buddharāja held sway over that region.[67] This also shows that the wicked lord of Malwa could not be Buddharāja for the former was killed by Rājyavardhana evidently before 606 A.D., for Harsa, the youngest brother of Rājyavardhana came to the throne in that year.

RĀJYAVARDHANA AND ŚAŚĀṄKA

As it has been already stated, immediately after the death of Prabhākaravardhana, the Maukhari prince Grahavarman, the son-in-law of the deceased sovereign, was murdered by the king of Malwa, who imprisoned Rājyaśrī at Kanauj, and planned to invade Thāneśvara itself. Rājyavardhana, the eldest brother of Harsa, who had just succeeded to the throne, marched at once against and killed the king of Malwa, but was himself murdered by Śaśāṅka, the king of Gauda. We need not take into account the various court-scenes etc as described in the *Harsacarita*, for they are evidently the product of the poet's own imagination. Now, the epigraphs of Harsa give us the following account:

> "By whom Rājyavardhana plying his whip in battle, Srī Devagupta and others (*Śrī-Devaguptādayah*) —who resembled wicked horses (*dusta-vājina-iva*) were all subdued with averted faces; who after uprooting his enemies, after conquering the earth, and doing what was agreeable to his subjects, in consequence of his ad-

[66] *PHAI*, p 607, f.n. 3.
[67] For the Maitrakas, *infra*, Ch. ix.

herence to his promise gave up his life in the mansion of his foe".[68]

If we compare this epigraphic account with the statements of Bāṇabhatta, we find that the poet has missed a significant point. Bāṇa speaks of the defeat of the king of Malwa alone at the hand of Rājyavardhana, while the epigraphs show that Rājyavardhana defeated Śrī Devagupta and other kings, i.e., a confederacy that was pitted against him. That there was such a confederacy really is indirectly clear from other references in the *Harṣacarita* itself. Thus the Senāpati Siṃhanāda advises Harṣa : "Think not, therefore, of the Gauḍa king alone. So deal that...... no other follow his example...... these mock conquerors, these would be lovers of the whole earth".[69] Harṣa is also represented as saying: "I swear that unless in a limited number of days I clear the earth of the Gauḍas and make it resound with fetters on the feet of *all kings* who are excited to insolence, then will I hurl my sinful self, like a moth, into an oil-fed flame.......".[70]

It may be that Bāṇa has singled out the name of the king of Malwa possibly because he was the leader of this confederacy. So when Bāṇa says that a Mālava king killed Grahavarman and then threw Rājyaśrī into prison at Kānyakubja, the real thing seems to have been that a confederacy of powers killed Grahavarman and imprisoned the widowed queen. As among the kings of this confederacy the name of Devagupta is mentioned only in the epigraphs of Harsa, he seems to be the Mālava king referred to in the *Harsacarita*.

In any case, the army of the Mālava king "was routed with ridiculous ease",[71] but Rājyavardhana, according to the *Harṣacarita*, "had been allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of the king of Gauḍa, and then weaponless, confiding and alone despatched in his own quarters".[72] The commentator of

[68] *Ep Ind*, iv, p. 210; i. p. 67.
[69] *HC* Trans, p. 185.
[70] *ib.*, p. 187.
[71] *ib.*, p. 178
[72] *ib.*

the *Harsacarita* informs us that Śaśāṅka, the king of Gauda, invited Rājyavardhana with the promise of giving his daughter in marriage to him, and while the unlucky king was engaged in his dinner he was treacherously murdered.[73]

The account, if it is to be believed, clearly shows that Śaśāṅka acted in a most barbarous manner. Dr R. C. Majumdar, however, observes: "Further details of this incident may be revealed some day by the discovery of fresh evidence, but until then the modern historians might well suspend their judgment and at least refrain from accusing Śaśānka of treachery, a charge not brought against him even by the brother of the murdered".[74]

In support of his theory, Dr. Majumdar has scanned the sources thus:

(a) Bānabhatta and Yuan Chwang were both partisans of Harsa, while the commentator of the *Harṣacarita,* Śamkara, lived in the fourteenth century A.D., and as such their statements need not be taken as entirely historical.

(b) There is, again, great dissimilarities in the details as furnished by the Indian writer and the Chinese pilgrim, while one version of the *Si-yu-ki* makes no allusion to the treachery at all[75]

It is thus really difficult to determine how exactly Rājyavardhana was murdered by Śaśāṅka from the evidence of the literary sources only. As the epigraphs state that Rājyavardhana "in consequence to his adherence to his promise gave up his life in the mansion of his foe", we may suspect that Rājyavardhana was killed by Śaśāṅka in the latter's house. There is no reason to believe that Rājyavardhana was defeated by Śaśāṅka and the former either surrendered to the Gauda monarch or was taken prisoner in a straight fight.[76]

[73] *IHQ,* xii, p. 462.

[74] *HB,* p. 75

[75] *ib.,* pp. 71ff.

[76] R P. Chanda thinks that Rājyavardhana was killed by Śaśānka in a straight fight or that he was killed after he had been defeated or surrendered to the Gauda monarch, *Gauda-rāja-mālā,* pp 8ff. See also *Vānglār Itihāsa,* p. 107. Contra, *HNI,* pp 144ff; *IHQ, xii,* pp 462ff.

We do not know exactly what Śaśāṅka did after Rājyavardhana had been killed. Dr. Tripathi thinks that "Thāṇeśvara was deprived of its young ruler, and Kanauj, having lost its sovereogn as well as the timely support of the former kingdom, passed under the occupation of the king of Gauḍa, who, in order to divert the attention of Bhaṇḍi or his adversary's army, released Rājyaśrī, the widowed queen of Kanauj, from detention in that city".[77] A little scrutiny would show that Dr. Tripathi's contention is untenable. In the *Harsacarita*, we have the two following passages throwing light on the history of Kanauj after Rājyavardhana's death:

(a) Bhaṇḍi, the general, tells Harṣa: "I learnt from common folk that after His Majesty Rājyavardhana was taken to paradise, and Kānyakubja was sieged by the man named *Gupta*, queen Rājyaśrī burst forth from her confinement and with her train entered the Vindhya forest".[78]

(b) The attendants of Rājyaśrī told Harsa that "she (Rājyaśrī) was sent away from Kānyakubja, from her confinement there during the Gauda trouble, through the action of a noble man named Gupta".[79]

The *Gupta* who is given the epithet *'noble'* can hardly be identified with the *'vile Gauda"*. In some manuscripts, no doubt, in place of *"Guptanāmnā ca gṛhīte Kuśasthale"*, we have the reading *"Gaudair-gṛhīte Kuśasthale"* But if we take the two passages, quoted above, together, the former reading appears to be more probable. Śaśāṅka evidently could not occupy Kanauj, and it is not improbable that after the death of Rājyavardhana, he followed a strategical retreat realising that he was far away from his base. Bāṇabhaṭṭa informs us that Bhāskaravarman, the king of Kāmarūpa, entered into an alliance with Harsa immediately after the death of the latter's elder brother,[80] and this induced the Gauda king to fall back to his own kingdom, lest it should be attacked from the eastern side. This inference

[77] Tripathi, *HK*, p 67.
[78] *HC* Trans, p. 224
[79] *ib*, p 250
[80] *ib*, p 218

is forced on us by the fact that Harṣa, as we shall see in the next chapter, could not fight the Gauḍa king immediately after the death of his brother, but had to turn to other problems, and this opportunity was evidently created by the voluntary withdrawal of Śaśāṅka

CHAPTER IX

THE AGE OF HARSA

I

A DISCUSSION ON THE CHINESE EVIDENCES

After the death of Rājyavardhana, Harsa came to the throne of Thāneśvara in 606 A d. For the early career of the monarch, our only source is the work of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, which, however, as we have already stated, has got little historical value. We are informed that immediately after his elder brother was murdered, Harṣa marched with an army against the 'vile Gauḍa', i.e., Śaśāṅka, and on his way met with an envoy from Bhāskaravarman, the king of Kāmarūpa and a formal alliance, as already stated, was concluded between the two sovereigns. The *Harsacarita* shows that instead of marching against Śaśānka any further Harsa marched with an army against the 'vile Gauḍa', i.e., escape from the prison at Kānyakubja had entered the forest of the Vindhya. The Vindhya is, however far away from Kanauj, and it is difficult to believe how far the account is authentic Again Rājyaśrī was just on the point of committing suicide in the forest, when Harsa dramatically appeared and rescued her

Here ends the *Harsacarita,* which thus practically tells us nothing about the achievements of the Thāneśvara monarch, excepting that he made preparations against Śaśāṅka. For further details, we have to turn to the Chinese accounts A passage in the *Si-yu-ki* of Yuan Chwang has been the subject of great controversy among the Indologists, and it has been practically rejected as containing little historical truth In Watter's translation of the work, it runs as follows :

> "... ..as soon as Śīlāditya became ruler he got together a great army, and set out to avenge his brother's murder and to reduce the neighbouring countries to subjection *Proceeding eastwards he invaded the states which had refused allegiance and waged incessant war-*

> *fare until in six years he had fought the Five-Indias* . .... (according to other reading.. ...had brought the Five-Indias under allegiance). Then having enlarged his territory he increased his army...... and *reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon*".[1]

Beal gives, however, the following translation of the corresponding passage:

> "Having received these instructions he departed and assumed the royal office. He called himself the king's son (Kumāra), his title was Śīlāditya...... *He went from east to west subduing all who were not obedient ......After six years he subdued the Five-Indes.* Having thus enlarged his territory, he increased his forces......*After thirty years his arms reposed, and he governed everywhere in peace*".[2]

The above two translations are contradictory; for, while according to the first (Watters' translation), Harṣa reigned for *thirty years in peace,* according to the second (Beal's translation) *he fought for thirty years.* The late Dr. P. C. Bagchi, Vice-Chancellor, Visvabharati University, kindly examined for me the original Chinese text, and he was of definite opinion that Watters' version is the correct one.

Drs Altekar and Tripathi have seriously challenged Watters' version, for according to it Harṣa would make all his wars between 606 and 612 A.D.,[3] and then reign in peace up to 642 A.D.; but it is known from other sources that Harsa had to fight during this period:

(1) The Aihole inscription of 634 A.D. refers to the defeat of Harsa by Pulakeśin II. As the event is not mentioned in the Lonera inscription of 630 A.D., it is

[1] Watters, *l.c.* i. p 343

[2] Beal, *The Records,* i p 213.

[3] It is generally believed that Harṣa came to the throne in 606 A.D., the initial year of the Harsa era. For a discussion about the initial year of the Harsa era, *IHQ,* xxvii, p. 183, p. 321 & *IHQ,* xxviii. The discussions in this book show that the Chinese accounts do not go against the theory of the Harsa era starting from 606 A.D.

clear that Harsa was defeated sometimes after 630 but before 634 A D

(2) The *Life* shows that in 643 A D. Harsa returned from his campaign of Koṅgoda. "If Watters' reading be correct, how are we to reconcile this statement of Yuan Chwang with his other informations that Harsa made an attack on Koṅgoda (Ganjam) region as late as 643 A D." ?[4]

Dr. K. P. Chattopadhyaya is not prepared to accept these criticisms and holds that Harsa-Pulakeśin war took place before 612 A.D., and the Koṅgoda campaign of 643 A D does not go against Watters' translation, for if the thirty years of peace begins in 612 A.D., it would end in 642 A D.[5] The second part of Dr. Chattopadhyaya's theory may readily be accepted, but as regards the first part, based mainly on Fleet's account, there may be some hesitation

In my humble opinion, however, there would not be any difficulty in accepting the statement of the *Si-yu-ki*, if we interpret it in the full context of the notes left by Yuan Chwang. The *Si-yu-ki*, we know, was composed by some disciples and friends of the Chinese traveller from his notes. On these was composed also the *Life* of Yuan Chwang by his friend and admirer Hui-li. It is also well-known that the *Life* and the *Si-yu-ki* supplement each other.

Now, the statement of Yuan Chwang that Harṣa *fought for six years* and then *ruled for thirty years in peace* means evidently that the last thirty years of the monarch passed off smoothly. Yuan Chwang left India in 643 A.D when Harsa was still alive, but he maintained intimate connection with India till his death in 664 A.D There are Chinese translations of two letters showing examples of correspondence which passed between him and his Indian friends.[6] - Through these letters he must have been aware of the last days of Harsa.

The composers of the *Si-yu-ki* and the *Life* also knew the

[4] Tripathi, HK, p. 127.
[5] *PIHC*,- 1939.
[6] Bagchi, *India and China*, pp. 80-2.

last days of the king, inasmuch as the *Life* refers to his death in 654 A.D.[7] Thus the thirty years of his peaceful career would begin from 654 — 30 = 624 A.D. Before it, Harṣa spent six years in warfare i.e., his period of war extended from 618 to 624 A.D.

The Chinese historian Ma-twan-lin also speaks of only one period of Harṣa's conquests. His account runs thus :

> "In the Wu-te period (in the reign of Kho-at-su) of the T'ang dynasty (618-27) serious disturbances broke out in India. King Si-lo-y-to (Śīlāditya) raised a great army and fought with irresistible valour. The men neither took off their own armour nor the elephants their housings. He punished the kings of four parts of India, so that they all with their faces turned towards the north acknowledged his superiority".[8]

Thus we find that our interpretation of the *Si-yu-ki* is confirmed by the evidence of Ma-twan-lin Watters has pointed out that Harsa must have died in c. 647 A.D.[9] But the followers of the Chinese traveller are in mistake in putting his death 7 years later. It was evidently due to this mistake that in the *Si-yu-ki,* we have an account of 30 years of peace, which, in fact, lasted for 23 years only.

It may be said against the above view that according to the *Si-yu-ki,* Harsa started on his *dig-vijaya* as soon as he became the ruler, and as the date of this event is 606 A D how can we put the beginning of his conquests as late as 618 A D.? But here we have got to note several facts. The Harsa era, no doubt, starts from 606 A.D. showing that Harsa ascended the throne of Thāneśvara in that year, but the *Si-yu-ki* states that Harsa began his conquests after he became the ruler of Kanauj, and there is no proof that Kanauj also passed under him in that very year. We are informed that the statesmen of Kanauj, on the advice of their leading man Bāni or Vāni invited Harsavardhana to become their sovereign. But Harsa hesitated and at last consulted Avalo-

[7] Beal, *Life*, p 156
[8] *IA*, ix p. 19.
[9] Watters, *l c* i p. 347.

kiteśvara who advised him to rule the kingdom, but not to occupy the actual throne and not to use the title of *mahārāja*. "Thereupon Harsavardhana became king of Kanauj with the title Rājaputra and the style Śīlāditya".[10]

While speaking of Kanauj, the *She-kia-fang-che*, on the other hand, gives the following account: "It is the capital of the king of the Five-Indes. His name is She-lo-tu-to. He is of the Fei-sho (Vaiśya) clan. Wishing to establish himself (as king), he prayed to an image of Avalokiteśvara on the bank of the Ganges. The Bodhisattva replied—'You were a lan-jo (Āryanaka) bhiksu in your past existence. King Śaśāṅka of Karṇasuvarṇa has destroyed the law of the Buddha. You will make it prosperous and will be merciful when you are king over all the five directions. Don't sit on the Lion-throne and don't call yourself mahārāja.. .He carried on the administration of the kingdom with the help of his widowe younger sister".[11]

The Chinese writers have evidently offered us a concocted story showing that the early position of Harsa in Kanauj was not an easy one. After the death of Grahavarman, the place passed through utter confusion. As we have already seen, it came under the occupation of one noble Gupta who released Rājyaśrī from the prison. (*supra*, p. 282). The *Harsacarita* affirms that all the relatives of Grahavarman fled away from Kanauj,[12] while a Nalanda seal shows that Avantivarman had another son named Śrī Suva..... After Grahavarman's death, he was naturally the rightful claimant to the throne of Kanauj, and evidently his claim was set aside by Harsa. To white-wash this illegal act, the Chinese writers have evidently introduced the story of Avalokiteśvara in order to give it a divine sanction. The *She-kia-fang-che* is rather clear on the point showing that he prayed to Avalokiteśvara "wishing to establish himself (as king)".

Thus evidently setting aside the rightful claim of the

[10] *ib*, p. 343.

[11] The Late Dr P. C Bagchi kindly gave me his own translation of the above passage of the *She-kia-fang-che*.

[12] *HC. Trans*, p 224; Tripathi, *HK*, p 74.

younger brother of Grahavarman, Harsa came to power in Kanauj. It is not unlikely, as often the cases are, that there were parties upholding the claim of the deposed prince and this gave trouble to Harsa. In any case, Harsa came to power when the kingdom was in confusion and so it is absurd to presume that Harsa started on his *digvijaya* immediately after his coming to power. On this point, we have to take the evidence of the *Si-yu-ki* in a rather loose sense

Let us now determine what the *Si-yu-ki* means by the expression that Harṣa "reigned in peace for 30 (23 ?) years without raising a weapon" The Chinese traveller here evidently meant that after six years of warfare, his reign had been peaceful internally, and "the home provinces enjoyed the blessings of the orderly government" [13] In the subsequent discussions, I shall try to show that all the conquests of Harsa were made in the period 618-24 A.D., and later he had to meet only the border skirmishes and there was practically no big war in the period. In fact, Harsa-Pulakeśin war was not concluded about 630-4 A.D, as it is generally believed, and it was in the nature of trial of patience, possibly with no big engagement, and the conquest of Koṅgoda by Harsa in 642-3 A D. was a part of this campaign.

II

Harṣa's Campaigns in North India

If the *Si-yu-ki* is to be believed, Harsa first marched towards the east, evidently against the Gauda king Śaśāṅka, the murderer of his brother. While the *Harsacarita* stops abruptly after giving an account of his preparations against the 'vile Gauda', the *Records* are absolutely silent on the point. The *She-kia-fang-che,* however, states: "So the king with Kumārarāja (Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa) destroyed (subdued ?) the heretical king Śaśāṅka, his army and his followers". In another place, while describing Bodh-Gaya, the same work informs us: "In recent times, when king Śaśāṅka destroyed the Bodhi tree, he ordered

[13] Tripathi, *HK,* p. 127.

his ministers to break the image. He then returned to the east. The minister who was a believer raised a brick wall in front of the image and out of fear in his mind left a lamp inside. Outside it, he painted the image of the god Maheśvara. When it was completed he informed the king. When king Śaśānka heard about it he was seized with fear, his body got sores, his flesh rotted off and he died after some time The officer ran to the place, removed the brick wall and although many days have passed the lamp had not extinguished. At present it is kept in a dark chamber".

From the above account it is clear that Harṣa and Bhāskaravarman conjointly attacked Śaśāṅka, who was defeated for the time being, but managed to maintain his existence somehow. The *AMMK* refers to an actual conflict between king Ha i.e., Harsa and Soma (Śaśāṅka) and states that Soma was defeated "and was forbidden to move out of his country". We are informed further that king Ha or Harṣa was honoured with welcome in the land of the mlecchas i e, the eastern country and returned home.[14]

The Ganjam inscription of 619 A D. shows that Śaśāṅka was still in power, and if the *She-kia-fang-che* is to be believed, his defeat must have occurred after this date. The high percentage of silver in some of the gold coins of Śaśāṅka seems to show that the Gauda king was actually passing through bad days.

From the statement of Ma-twan-lin that Harsa adopted the title of "King of Magadha" in the year 641 A.D., it has been inferred, that Harsa conquered the eastern region in that year.[15] Now, the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang who visited the eastern countries in 637 A D states that king Śaśāṅka was already dead. On the other hand, according to the *AMMK,* Śaśāṅka's son Mānava ruled for 8 months and 5 days What then happened to the eastern region?

[14] Jayaswal, p 50; *Text,* p. 54 · The original text runs thus · *"Nivartayāmāsa Hakārākhya mleccha-rajye mapūjitah".* The term *'mapūjita'* carries no meaning. Dr. R G. Basak's translation of it as *"not being honoured"* (*HNI,* p. 152) does not commend to us The Tibetan reading *'prapūjita'* is, no doubt, the correct form.

[15] *HB,* p 79

Yuan Chwang is silent about the government of the different countries of this region, and from these two different conclusions have been made : (i) Dr. Tripathi thinks that at that time they were incorporated within the empire of Harsa; (ii) Dr. Majumdar infers that these were then in a state of confusion, only Magadha being under the rule of Pūrṇavarman, "the last of the race of Aśoka rāja".[16]

As we shall see later on, such silence of the *Si-yu-ki* really means nothing.[17] The Ganjam inscription of 619 A.D. shows Śaśāṅka as the supreme ruler, while the Midnapore inscription of 629 A.D. shows that he was still alive but not taking the title of mahārājādhirāja.[18] If we study these inscriptions in the background of the accounts furnished by the *She-kia-fang-che* and *Ma-twan-lin*, we may possibly infer that sometime between 619 and 624 A.D., Harsa and Bhāskaravarman conjointly defeated Śaśāṅka who was compelled to accept a subordinate status.[19] He evidently lived for some years more and died a little before 637 A.D[20]

Dr. Tripathi thinks that after the death of Śaśāṅka the whole of Bengal passed under the rule of Harṣa.[21] Other scholars who maintain a similar view point out that as we have got inscriptions from the Eastern Bengal dated in the Harṣa era, that region must have formed a part of his territory, for it is well-known "that an era could be employed in those territories only, which were once within the jurisdiction of its originator", or, subsequently brought under the jurisdiction of his descendants, using the same era. We know that Harsa left no heir and after his death his empire fell to pieces Thus the discovery of an inscription from the Eastern Bengal dated in the Harṣa era, it is believed, would prove that the region was under the sway of the Kanauj monarch.

[16] Tripathi, *HK*, Chs. iv & v; *HB*, pp. 79ff.
[17] *infra*,
[18] For the Midnapore inscription, see, *supra*.
[19] For Ma-twan-lin and the *She-kia-fang-che*, see *supra*
[20] Yuan Chwang in his account of Magdha which he visited in 637 A.D. calls Śaśānka a *'recent king'*.
[21] Tripathi, *HK*, p. 119

The Asrafpur inscription of Devakhaḍga and a Tipperah grant of Lokanātha are the two records that have been utilised for the purpose. The dates of both the records are uncertain. Bhandarkar thinks that the date of the Asrafpur plate is 60 + 3, while, according to Dr. R. C. Majumdar the date is either 70 + 3 or 70 + 9. Similarly, according to some scholars, the date of the Tipperah grant is (1) 44, while, according to others, (3) 44.[22]

Those who advocate the dates 70 + 3 or 70 + 9 and 1 (44) favour their assigning to the Harsa era Recently Dr. D. C. Ganguly has shown that the date of the Asrafpur plate is simply 7, and it must be the regnal year of the king Devakhaḍga[23] On the other hand according to Dr. R. G. Basak, the date of the Tipperah grant is definitely 344 and the same is to be referred to the Gupta era.[24]

Thus there is no certainty that there are inscriptions from the Eastern Bengal assignable to the Harsa era. The *She-kia-fang-che* states, on the other hand, as we have already seen, that Harsa and Bhāskaravarman conjointly fought against Śaśāṅka, and though their first attempt might have failed, ultimately the Gauda kingdom was destroyed The Nidhanpur epigraph shows that Karnasuvarṇa, the capital of Śaśāṅka, passed under the sway of the Kāmarūpa monarch,[25] and it is but natural for us to think that Bhāskaravarman occupied the eastern part of Śaśānka's kingdom as a part of his joint victory. There is absolutely nothing in support of the theory that Bhāskaravarman occupied Bengal to the east of the river Ganges during the confusion following Harsa's death.[26] It is not unlikely that the Ganges formed the boundary between the kingdoms of Harsa and Bhāskaravarman.

We have already stated that if the *Si-yu-ki* is to be believed, all the conquests of Harsa were made during the period 618-24 A.D. But unfortunately we have got actually very little details of his conquests, excepting what we may call the border skirmishes.

[22] For a discussion of the dates of these plates, *HB*, pp 85-90.

[23] *Ep. Ind.*, xxvi p. 125

[24] Basak, *HNI*, p. 195.

[25] *Ep. Ind*, xii, p. 65; xix, p. 115.

[26] Majumdar, *Ancient Indian History & Civilisation*, p 348.

There are two statements in the *Harsacarita* of Bāṇabhaṭṭa that now require consideration. Thus it is stated that Harsa (i) "the greatest of all men having pounded the king of Sind made his wealth his own", (ii) "took tribute from an inaccessible land of snowy mountain". The first has been interpreted to mean that Harsa defeated the king of Sind, and the second, according to Buhler, refers to Harṣa's conquest of Nepal, while, according to Levi, who rejects, and rightly, Buhler's interpretation, it means that Harsa exacted taxes from mountains and inaccessible lands where lived the Tukhāras, i e., the Turks in N.W India. Bāṇa gives the above descriptions involved in puns while cataloguing the "marvels *reported* about" Harsa, and hence anything hardly can be vouched for the authenticity of the account. We have no evidence to corroborate the fact that Harsa ever defeated a king of Sind or took tribute either from Nepal or from N W. India. In fact, a critical study of the original passages, quoted below, offers us a different meaning altogether :

(i) "*Atra Puruṣottamena Sindhurājam pramathya Lâksmīh ātmīkrtāh*"

(ii) "*Atra Parameśvareṇa tusāraśailabhubo Durgāyā grhitah karah*" [27]

Here Harsa has been compared with Purusottama or Visṇu and Parameśvara or Śiva, and the wife of Harsa is compared with Laksmī and Durgā Indeed, in the whole passage we have vague statements about Harsa, and it would be improper to force meaning in them.

III

A Note on Harsa-Pulakeśin War

Harsa's greatest rival was Pulakeśin II, the Cālukya king of the Deccan, and often there were clashes between the two kings. In the Aihole inscription of 634 A D, Pulakeśin claims victory over Harsa, and some scholars think that the war took place somewhere near the river Narmada.[28] But it

[27] *Harṣacarita,* Calcutta ed pp. 210-11.
[28] R K Mookerjee, *Harsha,* p. 43.

appears that the war did not end there, and there were clashes even after this date. Thus while describing Mahārāstra, which the pilgrim visited in 641 A.D., the *Si-yu-ki* states: "At present time Śīlāditya mahārāja has conquered the nations from east to west, and carried his arms to remote districts, but the people of this country alone have not submitted to him. He has gathered troops from Five Indes, and summoned the best leaders from all countries, and himself gone at the head of his army to punish and subdue these people, but he has not yet conquered their troops"[29] If this account is to be believed, there is no reason to think that Harsa-Pulakeśin war came to a final close about 634 A.D., though Harṣa may have once been defeated about that time.

Harsa's campaigns in Kongoda, identical with the modern Ganjam district, in the year 634 A.D,[30] appears to be a part of his strategy against his southern rivals In the Aihole inscription, Pulakeśin is credited with the conquest of Kalinga and Kośala. Kongoda was thus a part of the Cālukyan empire, and Harsa's conquest of it proves that though he was defeated in 630-34 A D, he was able to avenge that defeat by snatching away from the Cālukyas the eastern part of their empire.

Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that Harsa's war with Dhruvabhata II of Valabhī ultimately led to the war between Harsa and Pulakeśin II. It has been said that there was a confederacy consisting of the Lātas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras, headed by Pulakeśin against Harsa, and when the latter attacked Dhruvabhata, the lord of Valabhī, he was involved in a war with the Cālukya king.[31] The assertion is based on the statement of the Aihole inscription that the Lātas, the Mālavas and the Gurjaras acknowledged the supremacy of the South-Indian monarch While editing the inscription, Keilhorn remarked that possibly "impressed by the majesty and power of Pulakeśin (these states) had voluntarily submitted to him or sought his protection".[32]

[29] Watters, *l c* ii p. 239
[30] Beal, *Life*
[31] *JBORS*, ix p. 319
[32] *Ep Ind*, vi p 2.

The remark, however, is somewhat misleading. The separate mention of the Lātas and the Mālavas in the Aihole record carries no meaning, for on the eve of the Harṣa-Pulakeśin war of c. 634 A.D., Mālava was under the occupation of the Lāṭa king, while the Gurjaras were latter's subordinates.[33] Secondly, regarding Harsa's war with the lord of Valabhī, our only source is the Nausari grant of Jayabhata III of the year 706 A.D., wherein we learn that the Gurjara king Dadda II alias Praśāntarāga of Broach protected Dhruvabhata or Dhruvasena II, when the latter was "defeated by the great-lord or Parameśvara, the illustrious Harsadeva".[34] The earliest known dates of Dadda II are furnished by his two Kaira (Kheda) grants of 629 and 634 A.D; but they are absolutely silent about the protection given to the Valabhī king.[35] Thus the war between Harsa and Dhruvabhaṭa II must be placed after 634 A.D., and thus the Valabhī affairs has hardly any connection with the war of 630-34 A.D. It is, however, not unlikely that sometime after this date the Valabhī king entered into a conspiracy with the Cālukyas and was threatened by Harṣa. Ultimately, however, there was peace between the two kings and the Valabhī ruler became the son-in-law of Harṣa.[36]

On the northern frontier of his kingdom, Harsa came into contact with Kashmir. From the *Life* we learn that Harsa heard that Kashmir had in her possession a tooth of the Buddha. Harsa came personally to the frontier and asked permission to see and worship it. When the congregation refused to accede to the request, the king of Kashmir personally intervened in the matter and presented the same to the Kanauj monarch. "Śīlāditya seeing it was overpowered with reverence, and exercising force, carried it off to pay it religious offerings".[37]

[33] see *intra.*
[34] *IA,* xiii. pp 77-9.
[35] *IA,* xiii p. 82ff.
[36] Watters, *l c.* ii. p. 246.
[37] Beal, *Life,* p. 183; Watters, *l.c.* i p. 279.

IV

The Extent of Harsa's Empire

&

SOME CONTEMPORARIES OF HARSA

Various theories have been maintained regarding the extent of Harṣa's empire In *JBORS* (V) 1923, pp. 320ff, Dr. R. C. Majumdar pointed out that "we know from the Harsacarita that his (Harsa's) ancestral kingdom comprised the Thaneswar district and its neighbourhood, including the valley of the Sarasvatī river. The accounts of Hiuen Tsang leave no doubt that he ruled over Kanauj. The Banskhera plate and Madhuban copper plate record grants of land respectively in the Ahichhatra and Śrāvasti *Bhuktis*. The way in which Hiuen Tsang describes the ceremonies at Prayāga seems to show that it was within the dominions of Harsa. Thus his territory comprised the districts roughly corresponding to the present United Provinces of Agra and Oudh with a small portion of the eastern Punjab. The coins attributed to him and to his father were also found within this area.

"So far, we are on tolerably certain grounds. But it is probable that Harsa also ruled over Magadha, for the Chinese documents connected with his embassy to that country seem to style him 'king of Magadha'. According to this view Harsa's dominions were bounded by the Himalayas, the western Punjab, Rajputana, Central India and Bengal".

The above observation must fully be accepted in the present state of our knowledge, with the proviso that a portion of Western Bengal, to the west of the Ganges, was also possibly included within the dominion of the Kanauj emperor. We learn from the Chinese pilgrim that Śīlāditya held his court at Kajaṅgala and from the *Life* it is also clear that Harsa exercised his suzerainty over Orissa as well[38] Orissa was conquered in 643 A.D, when Harsa undertook his Koṅgoda campaign. In this

[38] Beal, *Life,* p 154.

connection, it is worth while to note the accounts of the *Records* regarding the kingdom lying adjacent to Magadha:

1. *I-lan-na-po-fa-to*: (Monghyr) The *Records* state: "in recent times the king of a neighbouring state had deposed the ruler and given the capital to the Buddhist brethren".[39]

2. *Chan-po*: (Campā or modern Bhagalpur) Yuan Chwang is silent about its political condition.

3. *Ka-chu-wen* (?) *-ki-lo*: (Kajaṅgala, identified by Cunningham with the modern Rajmahal) The Records state: "The native dynasty had been extinguished some centuries before the time of the pilgrim's visit, and the country had come under a neighbouring state, so the capital was deserted and the people lived in towns and villages. Hence when king Śīlāditya in his progress to East India held his court here, he cut grass to make huts, and burned these when leaving."[40]

In Northern Bihar, the *Records* speak of the following Kingdoms:

1. *Kei-pi-lo-fa-su-tu* or Kapilāvastu: The *Records* state: "The country was without a sovereign, each city having its own chief".[41]

2. *Lan-mo* or Rāma or Rāmagrāma. The *Records* state nothing about the political condition of the country.[42]

3. *Kou-shih-na-ka-lo* or Kuśinagara (modern Kasia): "The city walls were in ruins, and the towns and villages were deserted. The brick foundations of the old city (that is, the city which had been the capital) were above ten li in circuit; there were very few inhabitants, the interior of the city being a wild waste."[43]

In the above description it is to be noted that the *Records* speak indirectly of a neighbouring ruler having sway over the *I-lan-na-po-fa-to* and *Ka-chu-wen* (?) *-ki-lo* countries while the same is silent regarding the political condition of the other states. Dr. Tripathi thinks that the king of a neighbouring

[39] Watters, *l c* ii p 178; Beal, *Records*, ii p. 187
[40] Watters, *l c* ii p 183; Beal, *Records*, ii. p 193.
[41] Watters, *l.c.* ii. p. 1; Beal, *l.c* ii p. 14.
[42] Watters, *l.c* ii p. 20; Beal, *l.c* ii. p 26
[43] Watters, *l c* ii p 25; Beal, *l.c.* ii. p 32.

state mentioned in connection with the I-lan-na-po-fa-to country should be identified with Harsa.[44] But had such been the case the Chinese pilgrim would certainly have explicitly mentioned the fact and would not have simply made an indirect and casual reference. We are inclined to believe that the ruler in question was a subordinate potentate under the Kanauj monarch. It has not been noted by several writers that the kingdom of Harsa contained several feudatory states within its border. For the sake of clearness we may note some of them here :

(a) The Kudarkot inscription (Bhandarkar no. 1788) records the erection of some building in the memory of Takṣadatta by his father Harivarman (Mamma), son of Haridatta, who had been "raised to eminence by the illustrious Harṣa." Here Harṣa evidently refers to the Kanauj monarch of the same name who evidently made Haridatta a subordinate chief in the region where the inscription has been found, Etawa dist. U P.

(b) From the Aphsad inscription it appears that Harṣa installed Mādhavagupta, son of Mahāsenagupta, the Later Gupta king, as a subordinate ruler under him on the throne of Magadha. Mādhavagupta possibly administered the eastern region in the name of his suzerain. While giving an account of Magadha, the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang, however, states : "In recent times Śaśāṅka, the enemy and oppressor of Buddhism, cut down the Bodhi-Tree, destroyed its roots down to the water, and burned what remained. A few months afterwards Pūrṇavarman, the last descendant of Aśoka on the throne of Magadha, by pious efforts brought the tree back to life and in one night it became above 10 feet high". From the description it appears that Pūrṇavarman was a contemporary of Śaśāṅka and it was evidently after his death that the charge of Magadha was bestowed upon Mādhavagupta. From the nature of the description in the *Si-yu-ki* it also appears that when the Chinese pilgrim visited Magadha, Pūrṇavarman was not on the throne of the country. It is not unlikely that the neighbouring king referred to in connection with *I-lan-na-po-fa-to* and *Ka-chu-wen* (?) *-ki-lo* may have been Mādhavagupta, the subordinate chief

[44] Tripathi, *HK*, p 101.

under Harṣa. The fact that Harṣa pitched his camp in the Kajaṅgala country seems to indicate that the region was under his sway, for as Yuan Chwang informs us the Kanauj sovereign "made visits of inspection throughout his dominion... having temporary buildings erected for his residence at each place of sojourn."[45]

(c) Mathurā or Mo-tu-lo: The *Records* state that "the king and his statesmen devote themselves to good works."[46] It is very unlikely that Mathura was an independent kingdom, while the statement of Alberuni that in his time the Harṣa era was used in "Mathurā and the country of Kanauj" seems to show that the suzerainty of Harṣa extended over the region.[47]

(d) Ma-ti-pu-lo or Matipura: The *Records* state that "the king who was of the Śudra stock did not believe in Buddhism and worshipped the Devas."[48]

(e) Chih-chi-to, identified with the kingdom of Jajhoti. Its capital was Khajuraho corresponding to the modern Bundelkhand region. The *Records* state that "the king who was a Brāhmaṇa was a firm believer in Buddhism and encouraged men of merit, and learned scholars of other land collected here in numbers"[49] It is not clear whether the king was a subordinate under Harṣa, but the discovery of an inscription from Khajuraho itself dated in the Harsa era[50] seems to point to such a fact, though of course not conclusively.

For the existence of the above feudatory states within the dominion of Harṣa, Dr. Tripathi gives the following explanations:

"(a) These states in order to save themselves from being swept away by the war-frenzy of Harsa must have offered their alliance at the very beginning. And Harṣa, who stood in dire need of allies then, astutely tolerated their continued existence."

[45] *Ibid.*
[46] Watters, *l c* i. p 303; Beal, *l c.* i p. 181.
[47] Sachau, *Alberuni's India,* ii. p. 5; *JBORS,* ix p. 323.
[48] Watters, *l c.* i p. 322; Beal, *l.c.* i. p. 190; *Life,* p. 79.
[49] Watters, *l.c* ii. p. 251; Beal, *l c* ii. p. 271
[50] *Ep. Ind.* v. *Appendix,* Keilhorn, no 545; Bhandarkar, no. 1408

ed and subsequently reinstated by Harsa, having accepted his
" (b) The kings of these territories may have been conquer-
nominal suzerainty. Similarly, we are told in the Allahabad Pillar inscription that Samudragupta 'established (again) many royal families, fallen and deprived of sovereignty' ".[51]

While we may accept the above explanations, we may at the same time not ignore the fact that in the *Harṣacarita* Siṃhanāda is stated as advising Harsa to teach other kings, who following the example of the wicked lord of Malwa had become insolent, a good lesson so that they may not again follow a similar course in the future.[52] The description evidently implies that Harsa uprooted many kings who had refused allegiance. In this light, we are inclined to think that Harṣa placed Mathura, Matipura, Jejakabhukti etc., under his own nominees, after uprooting the royal dynasties that had been ruling over these territories.

The above examples further go against the theory of Dr. Tripathi and others[53] that whenever the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang is silent about the political condition of a country it meant that it was under the political supremacy of Harṣa, and contrarily, whenever we find the mention of a state with a king it was outside such supremacy. The examples of Mathura, Matipura etc invalidate the second part of the theory at once As regards the unsoundness of the first part of the same we may note the fact that the *Records* are silent about the political condition of S. Kośala, but the *Life* says that the country was at that time under the rule of a Ksatriya king.[54] Such a theory further creates confusion with regard to Eastern India which the pilgrim visited about 637 A.D., while by his campaigns in Orissa in 643 A.D. Harsa added a considerable portion of the territory within his own dominion

Thus the *Records* cannot be our guide for determining the extent of Harsa's kingdom, far less do the same indicate that whenever the account is silent about the government of any state

[51] Tripathi, *HK*, pp. 119-20.
[52] *HC*. Trans., p 185
[53] Tripathi, *HK*, pp. 114-9.
[54] Beal, *Life*, pp 134-5.

it was included within Harsa's territory. We should repeat here the warning of Watters: "He (Yuan Chwang) was not a good observer, a careful investigator, or a satisfactory recorder, and consequently he left very much untold which he would have done well to tell."[55]

In determining the extent of Harṣa's empire some scholars have taken as guide the provenance of epigraphic records dated in the Harṣa era. Now, it is generally agreed that the following inscriptions are dated in that era:

(a) Banskhera (Shajahanpur Dist., U.P.) and the Madhuban (Azamgadh Dist., U.P.) plates of Harṣa dated in the years 22 and 25 respectively (Bhandarkar, nos. 1385 and 1386).

(b) Shahpur (Patna Dist., Bihar) image inscription of Ādityasenadeva of the year 66 (ibid. no. 1393).

(c) Punjab inscription of the time of a certain Vyāghra, year 184 (ibid. no. 1406)

(d) Khajuraho (Chhatarpur State, Bundelkhand) image inscription, year 218 (ibid. no. 1408).

(e) Ahar inscriptions (Bulandshahr Dist., U P.) with years 258-298 (ibid. nos. 1409-11, 1414-15, 1417-20).

(f) Peheva (Pehoa) (Karnal Dist., Punjab) inscription of the time of the M. Bhojadeva, year 267 (Bhandarkar, no 1412).

(g) Panjam inscription of the year 563 or 562 (ibid no. 1421).

(h) Dhauli (Puri Dist, Orissa) cave inscription of the time of Śāntikaradeva, year (2) 93 (ibid. no. 2042).

If the provenance of the Harsa era has got any connection with the extent of the empire of the Kanauj monarch, then it is clear that it included, as already stated, the Eastern Punjab, the whole of U.P. and Bihar and portions of the Madhyapradesh and Orissa. As we have already stated there is further indirect evidence that at least a portion of Western Bengal was also included within the empire.

[55] Watters, *l.c.* i. p. 15.

NEPAL

Bhagawanlal Indraji and Bühler assume that Harsa era was in vogue in Nepal and hence his suzerainty was also recognised in that valley.[56] In his *"Chronology of the Early Rulers of Nepal"*, Fleet also accepted this theory.[57] This leads us to a critical study of the early history of Nepal. As it has already been stated, the ancient kingdom of Nepal comprised the region lying between the basins of the Gandak and the Kosi, which is still known as *"the valley of Nepal"*. Our chief sources for studying the history of this mountainous kingdom are the following: (a) the Vaṃśāvalis or the local chronicles; (b) the epigraphic records, including the coins; and (c) the foreign accounts, specially those left by the Chinese and the Tibetan authors.

Early European scholars like Kirkpatrick and Wright made attempts to reconstruct the history of the land from the Vamśāvalīs[58] but in 1884 Indraji brought out clearly the unhistorical character of these chronicles.[59] The fictitious character of these documents is demonstrated by the fact that according to the system of chronology adopted in these texts Amśuvarman, the Nepalese contemporary of Harsa, would reign in 101 B C, i.e, roughly 700 years before his actual date.[60] They have further introduced into their lists the mythical kings of the Purāṇas, with abnormal reign-periods, and so from the strict historical point of view these records are absolutely worthless. In his *"Chronology and History of Nepal"*, Jayaswal has made a fresh attempt to utilise the evidences furnished by the Vamśāvalīs, but apparently without any satisfactory result.

The stone inscriptions of Nepal are undoubtedly the most important source for studying the ancient history of the valley.

[56] *IA*, xiii. pp. 411ff.

[57] *Corpus*, iii. *App.* iv. pp. 177ff.

[58] Kirkpatrick's work was published as early as 1811, and Wright's work in 1877

[59] *IA*, xiii. pp. 411-28.

[60] Levi, *Le Nepal*, ii. p. 69.

For the period under review in the present volume, we have to concentrate our attention on Indraji's inscriptions[61] nos. 1-15, Bendall's inscriptions[62] nos. 1-4 and some in M. Levi's admirable volumes *Le Nepal.*[63] Dr. Basak has also made a fresh study of them in his *History of North-Eastern India,* pp. 242ff.

These inscriptions can be classified into two groups, those dated in the smaller figures (30, 32, 34, 39 etc.) and those that are dated in larger figures (386, 387, 413, 435, 510 etc.). On one point, however, we are certain that the inscriptions bearing dates in smaller figures are later in date than the inscriptions datd in larger figures. The inscriptions of the first group begin with the reign of Aṃśuvarman, and hence they must be dated according to an era which started either in the later part of the sixth or the early part of the seventh century A D. As already stated, Indraji, Bühler and Fleet thought that they are dated in the Harsa era of 606 A.D, and this view has been adopted by several subsequent writers including Dr. Basak. Levi has conclusively proved that Harsa's suzerainty never extended into the Nepal valley, and that during Amśuvarman's time Nepal was a vassal of the powerful Tibetan king Srong-tsang-gam-po to whom the Nepal king was compelled to give his daughter in marriage. Levi concluded that the era used in the records of Amśuvarman started from 595 A.D., which was possibly of Tibetan origin, starting from the reign of the Tibetan king, Lun-sang-so-lun-tsang.[64] In fact, the assumption that Amśuvarman's records are dated in the Harsa era cannot be reconciled with the fact that Amśuvarman was dead when the Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang visited North India,[65] for Aṃśuvarman's last record dated in

[61] *"Inscriptions from Nepal",* *IA,* ix pp 163-94.

[62] *IA,* xiv. p 98; *Journey in Nepal,* pp. 72ff.

[63] *Le Nepal,* iii. nos. i-xx.

[64] *Le Nepal,* ii pp 153-4; Jayaswal has controverted the view of Levi that Nepal was a vassal state under Tibet at the time of Amśuvarman He thinks that it was the Thākuri era, Amśuvarman being a member of the Thākuri dynasty, *Chronology of Nepal,* 16ff But the evidence of Tao-su-en proves the Tibetan suzerainty over the country, *JA,* 1894, ii. pp. 54ff. For R C Majumdar's view, see *B. C. Law Volume.*

[65] Watters, *l.c.* ii. p. 84; Beal, *l.c.* p. 81. In the *Si-yu-ki,* Amśuvarman is described as a *'recent king'.*

the year 45, if referred to the era of Harsa would give the date 606+45 = 651 A.D., but we know that the Chinese traveller left India before this date.

There is some controversy regarding the era to which the inscriptions bearing dates in larger figures are to be referred. Indraji thought that the inscriptions of king Mānadeva of the years 386, 387, 413 should be referred to the Vikrama era, while Fleet asserted that all these records are to be referred to the Gupta era of 319 A.D. Dr. R. G. Basak, on the other hand, thinks that— (a) the inscriptions of kings from Mānadeva to Vasantadeva are dated in the Vikrama era; (b) the inscriptions of kings Sivadeva I to Udayadeva are dated in the Gupta era, (c) the inscriptions of Amśuvarman, Jisṇugupta and Visṇugupta are dated in the Harsa era; and (d) the inscriptions of Narendradeva to Jayadeva II are again dated in the Harsa era. But unfortunately he does not state the grounds of his assumption.[66]

Levi has shown that these inscriptions are all dated in an era which started from 110 A.D., for the astronomical data furnished by the Kisipidi record of *Samvat* 449 agrees perfectly only with 482 Śaka current The French savant has ably controverted the view that these inscriptions are dated in the Vikrama era or the Gupta era

The ancient history of Nepal can be divided into two distinct chapters—one before the Tibetan invasion in the last part of the sixth century, and the other after it. The invasion of the Tibetan king Srong-tsang paved the way for the rise of Amśuvarman[67] who was originally subordinate under king Śivadeva I. This invasion possibly brought Nepal under the suzerainty of Tibet and this naturally marks an epoch in the history of the valley. We have, on the other hand, some coins of Amśuvarman with the title of mahārājādhirāja which shows that he was practically an independent ruler and nominally owed allegiance to Tibet. It is not unlikely that the marriage of his daughter with the Tibetan king Srong-tsang-gam-po contributed to a great extent to his assumption of practically an independent status As

[66] For a criticism of Dr Basak's views, *B C Law Volume*, i pp 626ff.
[67] vide, *supra*, p 276

his inscriptions have been found at Katmandu, Patan, Deo-Patan and Bagmati, Aṃśuvarman appears to have exercised his suzerainty in the very centre of Nepal valley. He died possibly a little before 643 A.D., for we have an inscription of his successor dated in the year 48 = 643 A.D. The Chinese traveller Yuan Chwang refers to him as a *"recent king"*, and as an author of a treatise on Etymology.

In his inscriptions, Jisṇugupta, the successor of Aṃśuvarman, acknowledges the suzerainty of Śrī Dhanadeva who was evidently a Licchavi and a successor of Śivadeva I. Levi has inferred from it that during Jisṇugupta's time there was some confusion and the rule of the Licchavis which was suppressed by Aṃśuvarman was restored again. Jisṇugupta was in no way related to Aṃśuvarman and may have been a plebeian of the Āhir stock as shown by the ending of his name in—gupta. It was in his time that Nepal along with Tibet helped the Chinese envoy, Wang-hiuen-tse, against Arjuna or Aruṇāśva, the usurper of Harṣa's throne. This event took place sometime between 647 and 650 A.D

KĀMARŪPA

We have discussed at length the history of ancient Nepal in order to show that it never formed a part of the empire of Harsa. Similarly, we cannot agree with Dr N. Roy that Kāmarūpa was included within the empire and Bhāskaravarman was a subordinate ruler under the Kanauj emperor.[68] For his theory, Dr. Roy has depended on the following statement of the Si-yu-ki : "The reigning king who was a Brāhmin by caste and a descendant of Nārāyaṇadeva was named Bhāskaravarman, his other name being Kumāra." The term *Kumāra* has been held to signify a dependent status. We, however, can hardly follow this line of argument for in that case, as Dr. R. C. Majumdar points out "the great king Kumāragupta of the Gupta Dynasty has also to be regarded as a dependent king."[69] The Nidhanpur copper

[68] For the views of Dr. N. Ray, *IHQ*, iii. 1927, pp 769ff; for a criticism of the same, *IHQ*, v. pp 229ff

[69] *IHQ*, v. p. 232.

plate, the Nalanda seal of Bhāskaravarman and the *Harṣacarita* present us with the following genealogy of the Varman kings of ancient Assam :

4th century A.D.	1. Puṣyavarman
	2. Samudravarman (= Dattadevī)
	3. Balavarman (= Ratnavatī)
5th century A.D.	4. Kalyāṇavarman (= Gandharvavatī)
	5. Gaṇapati (-varman) (= Yajñavatī)
	6. Mahendravarman (= Suvratā)
	7. Nārāyaṇavarman (= Devavatī)
6th century A.D. (234 or 244 G.E.).	8. Mahābhūtivarman, alias Bhūtivarman[71] (= Vijñānavatī)
	9 Candramukha (varman) (= Bhogavatī)
	10. Sthitavarman[72] (= Nayanadevī)

[70] Mentioned simply as Ganapati in the Nidhanpur plates, and as Ganendravarman in the Doobi epigraph.

[71] Mentioned simply as Bhūtivarman in the *Harṣacarita*.

[72] Sthitavarman in the *Harṣacarita*.

11. Susthitavarman,[73] alias Mrgāṅka (= Śyāmādevī)

7th century A.D. 12 Supratiṣthitavarman 13. Bhāskaravarman alias Kumāra[74]

Though the dynasty of Bhāskaravarman came into existence in the fourth century A D., it could not play any decisive role before the sixth century[75] when Bhūtivarman came to the throne of the country.[76] As we have already stated he possibly put an end to the rule of the Imperial Guptas in the Puṇḍravardhana region. Bhattasali thinks that he ruled from 520 to 560 A D. The Badganga Rock inscription refers to his Aśvamedha sacrifice,[77] while from the Nidhanpur record it appears that he not

[73] Susthitavarman in the *Harṣacarita*

[74] Mentioned by Yuan Chwang simply as Kumārarāja

[75] In a Nalanda seal, Puṣyavarman and his two successors are given the title of mahārājādhirāja As they were certainly contemporaries of the early Gupta monarchs, the account of the Allahabad record that Kāmarūpa became a vassal state under Samudra Gupta can hardly be taken in its face value This also goes against the theory of scholars who maintain that Puṣyavarman named his son Samudra after the name of his lord Samudra Gupta. Bhattasali, however, thinks that Pusyavarman was a contemporary of Candra Gupta I and named his son and daughter-in-law after the names of the son and daughter-in-law of his Gupta friend, *IHQ,* xi. p 22; see also, Barua, *Early History of Kāmarūpa,* p. 42; Bhattacharya, *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī, Intro* p 13; B K. Barua, *A Cultural History of Assam,* pp 19-20 for further discussions; also, *The Classical Age,* p. 90.

[76] A Nalanda seal refers to Mahendravarman, the grandfather of Bhūtivarman, as the performer of two horse sacrifices (*MASI,* no 66). But as the performance of the horse sacrifice carried little significance in this age, we cannot draw any specific conclusion about the thing Dr. Sircar thinks that the horse sacrifice in question was performed by Nārāyaṇavarman, father of Mahabhūtivarman (*IHQ,* xxi, pp. 143-5) In that case, Nārāyanavarman may be regarded as putting an end to the Gupta rule in the Puṇdravardhana region But we prefer to regard Bhutivarman as the hero of the act for he, and not his father, is described as capturing the whole of Kāmarūpa, i e, the region up to Karatoyā in the west, vide, *supra.*

[77] *JARS,* viii. pp 138-9; x. pp. 64-7; *IHQ,* xx pp. 143-5

only captured the whole of Kāmarūpa but had a circle of feudatory rulers under him. Hardly anything is known about the achievements of Candramukhavarman, the son of Bhūtivarman. In the Nalanda seal Candramukhavarman's son Sthitavarman is described as the performer of two horse-sacrifices. Sthitavarman's son Susthitavarman renowned as Śrī Mṛgānka, is described in the *Harṣacarita* as the *mahārājādhirāja* and as one "who took away the conch-shells of the lords of the armies, not their jewels; grasped the stability of the earth, not its tribute; seized the majesty of monarchs, not their hardness."[78] As it has been already stated, Susthitavarman was defeated by the Later Gupta king Mahāsenagupta, and it is also indirectly hinted in the Nidhanpur record.[79]

Susthitavarman had two sons, Supratisṭhitavarman and Bhāskaravarman, the latter being a contemporary and an ally of Harsa. Formerly it was believed that Supratisthitavarman never came to the throne, but the newly discovered Doobi Copper plates now show that he did actually reign for a few years.[80] The two brothers possibly fought against Śaśāṅka, as already stated, and may have been reduced to a subordinate position for the time being by the Gauda monarch.[81] It is difficult to determine exactly when Bhāskaravarman came to the throne, though this much is certain that he was already a king when Harsa marched against the murderer of his brother in 606 A.D. He certainly outlived Harsa, as we shall see presently, and may have lived up to c 650 A.D.

The following facts of Bhāskaravarman's reign are known to us:

(a) About 606 A.D. the Kāmarūpa king entered into an alliance with Harsa.

(b) Harsa and Bhāskaravarman conjointly defeated the Gauda king Śaśāṅka (vide, *She-kia-fang-che* account).

(c) He issued his famous Nidhanpur grant from Karṇasuvarṇa.

[78] *HC* Trans, p 117.
[79] *supra*, p. 274.
[80] *JARS*, xii. pp. 16-33; *IHQ*, xxvi. pp. 241 6
[81] *supra*, pp 278ff.

(d) He attended the assembly of Harṣa at Kanauj along with the Master of Law.

(e) After Harṣa's death in c. 647 A.D. when there was a combined Sino-Tibetan invasion Bhāskaravarman helped the invaders.

We learn from the *Harṣacarita* that after the death of Rājyavardhana, Harṣa started to avenge the death of his brother and when he had completed only one day's march from Thāneśvara and was on the bank of the river Sarasvatī, Hamsavega, the messenger of the Kāmarūpa monarch, approached him with the proposal that his master was willing to enter into an "undying association" with him.[82] Harsa at once took up the offer because it was evidently meant against Śaśāṅka, the common enemy of both the monarchs. Some scholars think that this alliance really bore no fruit for Harsa failed to do anything against the Gauda kingdom during the life time of Śaśāṅka. The *She-kia-fang-che* account, which has been noted before, clearly shows, however, that Śaśāṅka was really defeated by the combined forces of Śīlāditya and Kumārarāja.

The date of the Nidhanpur record is uncertain, but if we study it in the background of events referred to above we have to conclude that it was issued evidently after the defeat of Śaśānka as a result of which the region lying to the east of the river Ganges passed to Bhāskaravarman as a share of his victory. Dr. D. C. Ganguly has utilised the evidence of the *Si-yu-ki* to prove that Bhāskaravarman had under him practically the whole of the Gauda country.[83] It is stated that about 643 A.D. Bhāskaravarman with a large troop of elephants and ships went up the Ganges taking the Master of Law with him, to meet Harsa at Kajaṅgala This, according to Dr. Ganguly, implies control of the Kāmarūpa monarch over the province of Gauda. Dr. R. C. Majumdar, however, points out that "the passage of Bhāskara's army and ships can also be explained by the assumption of Harsa's suzerainty over Bengal."[84] From the strict poli-

[82] *HC* Trans, p 218.
[83] *IHQ*, xv. pp. 122ff.
[84] *HB*, p 78, fn 3

tical point of view the episode can only be clearly explained on the assumption that the Ganges formed the common boundary between the dominions of the two monarchs. Hence we are inclined to think that Bhāskaravarman occupied the region lying to the east of the Ganges immediately after the death of Śaśānka.

We learn from the *Life* that when Harsa was returning from his campaigns at Koṅgoda he pitched his camps at Kajaṅgala and sent a messenger to bring the Chinese pilgrim who was at that time in the court of Kāmarūpa. Bhāskaravarman refused to part with the pilgrim and informed the messenger that "he can take my head, but he cannot take the Master of the Law yet". This enraged Harsa, who sent again a messenger with the words "Send the head, that I may have it immediately by my messenger who is to bring it here". Bhāskaravarman got frightened and personally went to Kajaṅgala accompanied by the Chinese pilgrim. The two old allies met each other and there was a joyful reconciliation between the two. From this place the three distinguished persons advanced up the Ganges and arrived at Kānyakubja where they attended the religious assembly held at Harsa's command in which the Chinese traveller extolled the Mahāyāna doctrine and exposed the inherent poverty of the Hīnayāna system.[85]

At the time of the Sino-Tibetan invasion after the death of Harsa, Bhāskaravarman somehow saved himself by sending the foreigners thirty thousand oxen and horses, and provisions for all the army; to which he added bows, scimitars and collars of great value. He also presented to the Chinese general some rare articles, a map of his state and several statutes of Lao-Shun.[86] Some scholars think that it was during this turmoil that he occupied Bengal and pitched his camp at Karnasuvarṇa, from where he issued the famous Nidhanpur charter.[87]

[85] Beal, *Life*, pp 172ff.

[86] *IA*, ix p 20.

[87] Dr Basak observes: "... Karṇasuvarna passed into the hands of Bhāskara, through Harsha's conquest of it, at some date later than his first campaign against Śaśānka, which was led by him immediately after the murder of Rājyavardhana, and that the second campaign of Harsa might have taken place either during the life-time of Śaśāṇka or after

Levi has given us the following interesting details about king Bhāskaravarman :

> "At the time of Hiuan-tsang's visit king Bhāskaravarman was 'a descendant of the god Nārāyaṇa ; he was of the caste of the Brāhmanas', and had the title of 'Kumāra'. 'Since the possession of the kingdom by his family up to his time, the succession of princes covers a space of a thousand generations' (*Mem* II, 77). The evidence of his contemporary Bāṇa (*Harṣacarita,* chap. vii) confirms almost all these details. Finally, we possess since a few years ago an inscription of king Bhāskaravarman (Nidhanpur plates, *Ep. Ind.,* xii, 65), which takes back the genealogy up to king Bhagadatta, the famous adversary of the Pāṇḍavas, by a long list of ancestors. However, when he had business with others than Indians, the same prince boasted of another origin altogether. When the envoy of the T'ang dynasty, Li Yi-piao, paid him a visit during the course of his mission (643-646) the king in a private conversation, told him : 'the royal family has handed down its power for 4,000 years. The first was a holy spirit which came from China (Han-ti) flying through the air' (*She-kia-fang-che,* ed. Tok. xxxv, 1,94b, col.ult.). As though he would show sympathy for China, he asked the envoy to get him a portrait of Lao-tseu and a Sanskrit translation of the Tao-to-king. The Emperor, on his part,

his death. Another suggestion offers itself in this connection, that Karṇasuvarna might not at any time have formed any part of the Kāmarūpa kingdom at all, but Bhāskara might only have pitched his jayaskandhāvāra (victorious moving camp) there, as an ally of Harsha during the latter's second campaign referred to above, when the emperor came to Bengal for conquests On this view both North Bengal and Central Bengal were added to Harṣa's empire, and not to the kingdom of Kāmarūpa even in part" (*HNI,* pp 228-9) It is really difficult to agree with these theories, for how could Bhāskaravarman issue a charter from another's dominion. Similarly, we cannot agree with B K Barua that Bhāskaravarman conquered the whole of Bengal. (A Cultural History of Assam, pp. 24ff)

> wished to respond to this desire and promulgated an edict asking the master of the Law, Hiuan-tsang, to prepare the translation in collaboration with Taoist teachers "[88]

The above discussion of the history of Kāmarūpa clearly demonstrates the fact that the country was never subject to Harsa. Similarly, we cannot agree with Dr N. Roy that Valabhī Jālandhara, Kashmir and Sindhu were parts of the same kingdom. We now propose to take up one by one the history of these states in the first half of the seventh century A D

VALABHĪ

It has already been stated that the Maitraka dynasty of Valabhī was founded by Senāpati Bhaṭāraka and that the third king of the dynasty Droṇasimha I was crowned in the presence of his Gupta overlord[89] Droṇasimha I was succeeded by his brother Dhruvasena I whose records range from the Gupta year 206 to 226 = 525-545 A D He is described as *mahāsāmanta mahārāja*, showing that he still acknowledged the overlordship of the Imperial Guptas now confined in a remote corner of the Āryāvarta. Dhruvasena I was again succeeded by his younger brother Dharapaṭṭa who was succeeded by his son Guhasena, for whom we have records extending from the year 240 to 248. Guhasena was succeeded by his son Dharasena II who ruled at least for 18 years as shown by his records dated G E 252-270 There is hardly anything of interest in the history of these Maitraka kings[90]

Dharasena II left two sons, Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya and Kharagraha I There seems to have been some extension of the Maitraka territory about this time, and it appears from the *Records* that Śīlāditya I ruled at Mo-la-po or Mālava with its dependencies of Kita, identified with Cutch or Kheda, Ānanda-

[88] Bagchi, Pre-Aryan and Pre-Dravidian in India, p 114

[89] *supra*, pp 230f

[90] For an account of the Maitrakas, *IC*, v pp 407ff, *IHQ*, iv pp 453ff; Sankalia, Archaeology of Gujrat, pp 28ff

21

pura and Su-la-cha or Surat,[91] while the rest of the kingdom with Valabhī as centre was under Kharagraha I This account is corroborated to some extent by the Alina plate of Śīlāditya VII which associates Derabhata, son of Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya, with the region of Sahya and Vindhya mountains, while the descendants of Kharagraha I are connected with Valabhī[92]

Mālava or Western Malwa, as we have already seen, was under the Kalacuris in the last part of the sixth century A D., and thus it appears that after the reign of Dharasena II which ended c. 589 A.D, there ensued a Maitraka-Kalacuri rivalry. From the Sarsavani plates it appear that the sway of Buddharāja, the Kalacuri king, extended as far as the Bharukaccha viṣaya.[93] Thus for a time the Maitrakas were thrown into the background, but they soon gained power for Virdhi Copper plate grant of the year 616-17 A D shows Ujjayinī under their rule.[94] The lead in this respect was taken by the younger brother Kharagraha I, and thus there seems to have ensued a rivalry for power between the two sons of Dharasena II The Alina plates state: "Kharagraha I (who meditated on the feet of his elder brother) the goddess of sovereignty, even while she was still an object to be longed for by (his) elder (brother) who, excessively full of respect (for him), behaved as it were (the god Indra) the elder brother of Upendra" In a note, Fleet says: "Upendra, the younger brother of Indra, is Visnu. The allusion seems to be to the contest between Visnu (in his incarnation of Krshṇa) and Indra concerning the tree of Indra's paradise, in which Visnu was victorious and had homage done to him by Indra. . On this analogy it would seem that the two brothers Śīlāditya I and Kharagraha I had some dispute about the leadership of their family and that eventually Śīlāditya I conceded the question to his younger brother"[95]

In any case, the Virdi plates of 616 A D show that Khara-

[91] Watters, l c ii p 242, Beal, l c ii p 261. Life, p 148
[92] *Corpus*, iii. pp. 171ff
[93] *Ep Ind.*, vi. p 295
[94] Proceedings of the Seventh Oriental Conference, pp 659ff
[95] *Corpus*, iii. p 182, f.n 1.

graha I was the ruler of a kingdom extending from Valabhī to Ujjayinī He was succeeded by his son Dharasena III, who was succeeded by his brother Dhruvasena II Bālāditya (called Dhruvabhaṭa by Yuan Chwang), for whom we have records bearing the dates G.E. 310-321, showing that he ruled from c. 629 A.D. onwards Valabhī evidently continued to be the capital of the kingdom, and the *Si-yu-ki* while giving an account of it states: "The reigning sovereign was of Kṣatriya birth, a nephew of Śīlāditya the former king of Mālava, and a son-in-law of the Śīlāditya reigning at Kānyakubja; his name was Tu-lo-po-po-ta (i.e., Dhruvabhata); he was of a hasty temper, and of shallow views, but he was a sincere believer in Buddhism."[96]

As we have already pointed out the Nausari grant of 706 A.D. contains the reference how Dadda II of Broach protected the lord of Valabhī when he was attacked by the illustrious Harsadeva (*Parameśvara-śrī-Harsa-devābhibhūtah* etc)[97]. Dr. N Roy has inferred from it that Harsa "overpowered and subdued the lord of Valabhī". We fail to understand how the term '*abhibhūta*' can lead to such an inference. In any case, there was peace and Dhruvabhata married the daughter of Harsa and also attended the religious assembly at Kanauj The *Life* gives him the significant title of 'king of South India'.[98] There is thus no justification for the theory that Valabhī was a subordinate state under Harsa

GURJARAS

From the above discussions it also appears incidentally that the ruler of Broach who afforded protection to the Valabhī ruler was also independent of Harsa Two Kaira and three Samkheda grants reveal the existence of a line of Gurjara kings,[99] who held subordinate position under the main line of the Gurjaras ruling over Mandor The records give us the following genealogy:

[96] Watters, l c ii p 246, Beal, l c ii p 267; Life, p 149
[97] *supra*, p 303f
[98] Beal, Life, p 149
[99] *IA*, xiii p 82f, 88f · *Ep Ind*, ii p 21, v p 39f, xxiii p, 147f; xxv, pp 292f

"In the family of the Gurjara kings, the Sāmanta Dadda I, who uprooted the Nāgas, his son Jayabhata I Vitarāga; his son Dadda II Praśāntarāga."

Dr. R. C. Majumdar thinks that Dadda I, the founder of the line was identical with Dadda, the son of Haricandra, the founder of the Mandor line From the identification of the villages mentioned in the grants, it may be inferred that this subordinate Gurjara kingdom covered "the country from the north bank of the river Kim to the south bank of the Mahi, and so show the extent of the Gurjara territory in the neighbourhood of the coast, inland, it doubtless extended to the Ghats"[100]

The Samkheda grant of Śāntilla shows that Nirihullaka, a feudatory of the Kalacuri king Śamkaragaṇa, ruled over the territory round Dabhoi,[101] while the Sarsavani plates of Buddharāja, as already stated, prove that the districts of Kaira and Broach were under his sway. The last known date of the Kalacuris is 609-10 A.D.,[102] while the earliest known date supplied by the above Gurjara records is 629 A.D. when Dadda II had been on the throne, and hence it has been supposed that the Gurjaras "must have come into the possession of these territories after the Kalacuris" The inscription of the Maitraka king Kharagraha I of the year 616 A.D., however, shows that the Kalacuris were eclipsed by the descendants of Senapati Bhatāraka and Dadda II may thus have been a Sāmanta ruler under the Maitrakas. Dadda I is credited with uprooting the Nāgas to which stock Nirihullaka belonged (*supra*, p 217) The kingdom of Pa-lu-ka-ca-po or Bhrgukaccha mentioned by Yuan Chwang has been supposed to represent the kingdom of Dadda II[103]

From the Ghatiyala inscription it appears that the main line of the Gurjaras, the descendants of Haricandra, was ruling at this time with Mandor as the citadel of power[104] The

[100] *Fleet,* Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, p 315

[101] *Ep Ind*, ii p 21

[102] *AHD,* p 82

[103] Watters, l c ii p 241

[104] For the Gurjaras, R C Majumdar, *JDL,* x pp 1-76; Smith, *JRAS* 1909, pp 53f, 247f, for the Ghatiyala inscriptions, *JRAS*, 1895,

Si-yu-ki informs us that Yuan Chwang went north from Valabhī for about three hundred miles and reached the Ku-chi-lo or Gurjara country.[105] The distance points exactly to the Gurjara kingdom of Mandor. We are further informed that the king was a Ksatriya by birth, was a young man celebrated for his wisdom and valour, and was a profound believer in Buddhism and a patron of exceptional abilities. Tāta, the fifth king of the line, mentioned in the above epigraphs, seems to have been the monarch whom the Chinese traveller saw, for in verses 14-15 of the Jodhpur record it is stated that considering life to be as temporary as lightning, he abdicated in favour of his younger brother and retired to a hermitage and practised the rites of true religion[106] This confirms the account of the traveller that the Gurjara king was a profound believer in Buddhism

JALANDHARA

The above discussions clearly show that there is absolutely no evidence to prove the dependency of either Valabhī or the Gurjaras under the suzerainty of Harsa Similar appears to have been the case with Jālandhara, She-lan-ta-lo of Yuan Chwang The kingdom is described as about 1,000 li or 167 miles in length from east to west, and 800 li or 133 miles in breadth from north to south. Cunningham thinks that if these dimensions are even approximately correct, Jālandhara must have included the state of Chamba on the north, and Mandi and Sukhet on the east, and Śatadru on the south-east[107] The *Records* state that the king of this place became a believer in Buddhism, whereupon "the king of *Mid-India* appreciating his

pp 513ff, *Ep Ind*, ix pp 277ff It is generally believed that the Gurjaras were identical with the Wu-sun of Central Asia (*supra*, ch iii) The chief seat of the tribe in India was Mandor, in Rajputana, which thus came to be known as Gurjaratrā or Gurjarabhūmi As the Jodhpur inscription is dated 837 A D and of the five Ghatiyala inscriptions, three belong to 861 A D we may assume that the dynasty came to power c 550 A D. Nothing is known about the achievements of the early kings of the dynasty

[105] Watters, l c ii p. 249; Beal, l c ii p 270

[106] *Ep. Ind*, xviii pp 87f

[107] *CAGI*, p 156.

sincere faith gave him the sole control of matters relating to Buddhism in all India. In this capacity (as protector of the faith) the king of Jālandhara rewarded and punished the monks without distinction of persons and without private feeling".[108] The king of Mid-India has been identified with Harṣa and the whole thing has been construed to mean that the king of Jālandhara was a vassal under the Kanauj emperor. The inference, however, is extremely a dubious one. As Dr R. C Majumdar says "Apart from the fact that Harsa is hardly likely to be referred to simply as king of Mid-India by Hiuen Tsang, the passage hardly proves anything about the political relation of the two kings. The king of Jālandhara in his new role of Protector of Faith, is said to have travelled all over India, building new stūpas and Samghārāmas and visiting and inspecting old ones. It is difficult to place much historical value upon this story, except on the assumption that the king took to the life of a Bhiksu and was patronised by kings of Mid-India and other kingdoms which he visited".[109]

If the state of Jālandhara included Chamba, then it is curious that the *Records* speak nothing of the dynásty that had been ruling here. Its capital was Brahmor (Brahmapura) and several inscriptions[110] discovered here furnish us with the following genealogy of its rulers:

Ādityavarman of the Solar race
|
Balavarman
|
Divākaravarma-
|
Meruvarman c 700 A.D

As we have no records of the first three rulers, it is not unlikely that they were mere vassal chiefs under the kings of Jālan-

[108] Watters, l c i. p 296; Beal. l c. i. p 176
[109] *IHQ*, v p 231.
[110] *ASIR*, 1902-3, pp 242-4; Vogel, *Antiquities of Chamba*, pt. I, pp. 142ff.

dhara, and Meruvarman was the first member who brought the dynasty to prominence.

It has already been shown that inscriptions dated in the Harsa era are not found beyond the Karnal Dist. in the Punjab, and hence it may be inferred that the region lying to the west of the said district was outside Harsa's jurisdiction There has been some controversy regarding the date of the Nirmand (Kangra Dist., E. Punjab) plate[111] of the mahāsāmanta mahārāja Samudrasena of the year 6. Tripathi assigns the record to the Harsa era, while Bhandarkar maintains a different view It mentions the mahāsāmanta mahārāja Varmasena ; his son from Prabālikā, the mahāsāmanta mahārāja Sañjayasena; his son from Śikharasvāminī, the mahāsāmanta mahāraja Ravisena; his son from Mihiralaksmī, the mahāsāmanta mahārāja Samudrasena It also mentions a chief of the past, a mahārāja, Sarvavarman. This dynasty appears to have been subordinate under the rulers of Jālandhara and the year 6 possibly refers the regnal year of Samudrasena.

Thus Jālandhara appears to have been a kingdom of considerable importance in the first half of the seventh century A.D. The *Life* calls the king of the country as the sovereign of "North-India"[112] and this is conclusive proof of the independent status of the state

There thus appears to be no reason to think that Harsa was the lord of whole of North India, as Panikkar does,[113] nor should we take the expression *'Sakalottarāpathanātha'* given to Harsa in the southern inscriptions in its literal sense. We cannot agree with Dr. R K. Mookerjee when he states that "with all the possible reservations, it cannot be doubted that Harsa achieved the proud position of being the paramount sovereign of whole of Northern India".[114] Dr. Tripathi points out that a similar epithet is applied to one of the successors of mahārājādhirāja

[111] Aravamuthan, *The Kaveri, the Maukhari, and the Sangam Age*, p 93, Tripathi, *HK* p 54; *Corpus*, III, p. 287

[112] Watters, l c i p 297.

[113] Panikkar, Sri Harsha of Kanauj, pp 22f

[114] R K Mookerjee Harsa, p 43

Ādityasena of the Later Gupta line of Magadha, although "it is known beyond doubt that his dominions did not comprise the whole of Northern India."[115] Indeed, such expressions were often used in a vague and loose way and we need not seriously take them into account.[116]

HARṢA'S RELATIONS WITH CHINESE RULER

Harsa's intimacy with the Chinese pilgrim evidently induced him to establish friendly relationship with the Chinese emperor We learn from Ma-twan-lin that " (in 641) Śīlāditya assumed the title of king of Magadha and sent an ambassador with a letter to the emperor. The emperor, in his turn, sent Liang-hoai-king as an envoy with a royal patent to Śīlāditya with an invitation to him to submit (to the authority of the Chinese emperor). Śīlāditya was full of astonishment and asked his officers whether any chinese envoy ever came to his country since time immemorial. 'Never', they replied in one voice Thereupon the king went out, received the Imperial decree with bended knees, and placed it on his head "[117]

Those who are acquainted with the nature of Ma-twan-lin's description will at once perceive the true import of the above account. It is amusing to note that whenever any Indian chief has come into contact with the Chinese emperor, Ma-twan-lin has invariably described the incident as acknowledging the supremacy of the emperor by the Indian king Thus from the above description it only appears that in 641 A.D there were mutual exchanges of envoys between Harsa and the Chinese king

Again in 643 A D, soon after Yuan Chwang had returned to China, and evidently under his influence, the Chinese emperor sent another envoy named Li Yi-pao to king Harsa Li Yi-pao was accompanied by another Chinese officer named Wang-hiuen-tse. We are informed that "they reached Magadha after a journey of

[115] Tripathi, *HK*, p 121

[116] For a criticism of the theory that Harsa conquered South India, *ib.*, pp. 121-3, *IHQ*, v. p. 235

[117] *IA*, ix p 19, Ettinghausen, Harshavardhana, p 54

nine months On the completion of their official mission they visited the Buddhist holy places such as Rajgir, Grdhrakūta, and Mahābodhi, and set up Votive inscriptions in Chinese at Grdhrakūta and Bodhgaya"[118] They also visited Kāmarūpa and met king Bhāskaravarman who treated them with great respect. They returned to China in 647 A D.

The same year (647) Wang-hiuen-tse was entrusted again with a Chinese imperial mission to the Kanauj emperor. But unfortunately before the envoy could touch the soil of India, Harsa was dead, leaving the country in chaos and disorder

[118] Bagchi, India and China, p 82

ADDENDA et CORRIGENDA

Inadvertently in some places Ī. . .has been misprinted as I.
p. 24, line 17/20 *for* Āsādhasena *read* Āsāḍhasena
p. 24, ,, 26 ,, he ,, the
p. 31, ,, 5 ,, KĀṆAS ,, KĀṆVAS
p. 37, ,, 27 *for* BAHASTIMITA *read* BAHASATIMITA
p 38, ,, 3 *for* lical ,, local
p. 41, ,, 10 Agathoclea ,, Agathocleia
p. 44, A. N. Lahiri thinks that there were two kings of the name of Menander, Menander I and Menander II Menander I (Soter) is mentioned in the Bajaur inscription (*I.c.I*) and the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* (*ib*. 4) and issued the Athena coins (*ib*. 28f) while Menander II (Dikaios) issued the Nike type (*ib*, 32).
p. 47, line 10 & 21 *for* Agathoclea. .*read* Agathocleia
p. 49, ,, 29 The legends on the Āgreya coins have been variously read, and the issues indeed form a *puzzling group*, as J Allan has said. The shorter legend has been read as *Agodakā Agāca janapadasa*, or *Agodaka -Agāca jana- padasa*; '(coins) of the *Agāca janapada* issued from *Agodaka*' It has been suggested that Agōdakē is also a possible reading. But from the estampages of the coins in Allan's *Catalogue*, it is really difficult to determine whether there is at all any *ā* or ē sign after *k*. Under the circumstances, it is better to take the whole expression as a compound one *Agōdake Agāca* which in *samāsa* will be *Agōdaka-Agāca*, and *Agodaka-Agācānām janapada*(*h*): '(coins belonging to) the Agāca janapada located at Agōdaka.' It may of course be argued that according to the rule *samāse sa tu nityah syāt*, the compound form should be *Agodakāgāca*, but such strict rules are often violated in legends on coins and epigraphs The genitive sign after the word *janapada* is also doubtful, though such *genitives* are found on the majority of the coins after the name of a locality.

But we have also legends like *Yaudheyānāṃ Bahudhānyake* (i.e., *locative* in case of the last name of the place, not *Bahudhānyakasa* like *janapadasa*) or simply like *Vatāśvaka*, or *Udehaki*.

The longer legend is more puzzling as it cannot be read definitely. It has been provisionally emended by L D. Barnett as *Agāca-mitra-padābhiṣṭhāyinām* or *A°-mitra-padābhiṣṭhāyinaḥ* '(Coin) of the rulers (or ruler) of the Allied State of the Aggācas'. (*BSOS*, X, 274) As Barnett himself states the term *abhiṣṭhāyin* 'does not seem to be extant in literature' but maintains nevertheless that it can be derived from *abhi*+*sthā* which means 'stand upon', whereform he cooks up the meanings 'prevail over', 'dominate', 'be supreme', which occurs in the Vedic texts, and sometimes in later Skt. as well as Pali This only shows how a great scholar was painfully working to find out a meaning, hardly found in Classical Skt. Dictionaries, for the term coined by him. Further, the two different versions show that Barnett was not very sure of his readings and had been acting more on surmise. Allan reads the last portion of the legend ...as *mitrapadābhiṣayānā* (*ib*, 277 fn) which seems to convey no meaning D.C. Sircar suggests the reading *Agratya-mitra-pad-ābhiṣthāyinām*, which is not even remotely suggested by the evidence of the coins, not even by any possible emendation. Further, why the name of the place, *Agodaka*, is not mentioned in the reading of Barnett, when the name of the place wherefrom the coins are issued finds prominence in general ? Considering all these questions, I have accepted the reading, which when slightly emended, may solve such problems. As emended the legend would be *A° mitrapad-abhiṣyandinaḥ*: '(Coins) of the surplus allied area of A°-'. This will explain why there is no mention of Agodaka : (*mitrapad*=allied parts, *abhiṣyandinaḥ*=living in surplus areas). These coins were not issued from the central capital but by a confederate people, though it is not certain whether they entered into a confederation with the Śālvas, as Barnett holds. Indeed, these are 'puzzling coins' (Allan).

p.	52, line 18/21	*for*	*Bahudhānyaka*	*read*	*Bahudhānyake*
p.	52, ,, 21	*for*	Hariana	*read*	Haryana
p.	54, ,, 20	,,	Dharaghosa	,,	Dharaghosa
p.	63, ,, 4	,,	Mathridates	,,	Mithridates
p.	,, ,, 7	,,	scythians	,,	Scythians
p.	69, ,, 36	,,	p. 18	,,	p. 31

p. 70, ,, 29 Attempt has been made to find out historical elements out of the *Kālakācāryakathānaka* legend (B.N.

Mukherjee, *An Agrippan Source*, Calcutta, 1969, 481). It has, however, been observed that 'the story of the Śaka occupation of Ujjayinī before the beginning of the Christian Era is not corroborated by any reliable independent evidence' (*ib* 47-8).

p. 74, line 4-5 It has often been held that the Prakrit legends in Kharosthī scripts on the coins of Spalahora and Spalagadama suggest that they ruled in India, and possibly in Taxila The coins of Vonones, and his successors, come mostly from Kandahar, Ghazni and Seistan.

p 78f/69/105—	*for*	Sodāsa	*read*	Śodāsa
p. 92, line 12	,,	governor	,,	governed
p 102/104/141'	,,	Kuṣāna	,,	Kuṣāṇa

p. 102 Recently there has been much speculation whether the Kusāna empire extended beyond Benares The Chinese tradition regarding the invasion of Eastern India by Kaniska I has already been discussed (*supra*, 101-2) It is pointed out that as large number of Kuṣāna coins have been found at Buxar, Kumrahar and in 'stratified Kusāṇa strata' (?) at Chirand, Bihar was included within the Kusāṇa empire D.C Sircar observes that the eastern territory of the Kusānas comprised Bihar, Bengal and Orissa (*Some Problems of Kuṣāna and Rājput History*, Calcutta, 1969, 57). Besides evidence of the find-spot of the coins, he refers to a 'number of sculptures in which distinct affinities with the Kusāna art idiom have been recognised' (*ib*, 66). At the Dushanbe conference in USSR, in which I was also present, Sircar harped on the same theme, but had to face the comment that his contention was in the realm of probability As regards the evidence of coins, it has long been recognised that gold coins often migrate from one place to another because of the value of the yellow metal, while Sircar himself observes that copper coins are known to have been 'the principal currency of some kingdoms of ancient India, and the copper money had no doubt very considerable purchasing power in early times Thus the migration of copper coins from one territory to another even in the course of trade is probable' (*ib*, 57, fn. 24). Such an observation eats at the very root of his own theory. (cf. Bhaskar Chattopadhyaya, *The Age of the Kushānas, A Numismatic Study*, Calcutta, 1967, 240). Another argument adduced by D.C. Sircar is that the early

Licchavis of Nepal who evidently migrated from North Bihar used the Śaka era, while the same era is supposed to be used in the Kaiḷvan inscription, discovered in the Patna District of Bihar. But as he himself has said the use of the Kaniska era might have been carried to Bihar by the Mitras of Ahicchatra or of Kauśāmbī. Similarly, the Licchavis of Bihar became acquainted with the era probably by coming in contact with the Mitra kings of the place, if they had been living in Bihar at the time, of which we have no direct evidence at all. Further it is not yet beyond doubt that the early Licchavis of Nepal used the Śaka reckoning.

p. 105, ll. 10,13	*for* Sodāsa	*read*	Śodāsa
p. 105, line 23	,, Kausambī	,,	Kauśāmbī
p. 108, line 32	,, Rajatarangini	,,	Rājataranginī
p. 127, line 4	,, Puluhāyi	,,	Pulumāyi

p. 131-2. — In *JIH*, 1970, 253ff, D. C. Sircar has edited a short inscription from Andau (Cutch) belonging to 'the year 11 of Casṭana, the rājan and Ksatrapa.' Sircar remarks that he was evidently ruling there as Nahapāna's subordinate and that the date is to be referred to the Śaka era of 78 A.D. (=89 A.D.) while Nahapāna's records are to be dated in the same era also 'for a subordinate never uses an era other than his lord.' Such an assertion is hardly tenable in view of the Mandasor inscription of Kumāra Gupta I and Bandhuvarman of the Mālava years 493 and 529. It has already been shown that Nahapāna's records are dated in his regnal years and further that there is absolutely no evidence that his sway extended over the Cutch region (*supra*, 125f, 129). Again, Nahapāna was never a subordinate under the Kusāṇas; he takes nevertheless the titles of rājan and ksatrapa, while only in the inscription of the year 46, the last record of his reign so far known, he is described as 'king, Mahāksatrapa, Svāmī,' showing that the titles ksatrapa and Mahāksatrapa have rather been loosely used with reference to him (*SI*², 52); in other words, the practice of describing an independent Śaka ruler as Mahāksatrapa and a subordinate one as ksatrapa has not as yet crystallised into a definite shape in western part of India Considering all these facts, we are inclined to infer that Casṭana began his rule as an independent potentate. The next inscription from Andau of the year 52 (=130 A.D) refers

to both Castana and Rudradāman as ruling conjointly (*supra*, 132). A third inscription from the same place of the year 53 (=131 A.D.) [*Ep. Ind* xxxvii] refers, to the reign of Rājan Svāmī Rudradāman, son of Rājan Svāmī Jayadāman who was the son of Rājan Mahākṣatrapa Svāmī Casṭana. 'The importance of the record lies in the fact that it is not only the earliest inscription known so far of Rudradāman I's independent rule but also the earliest to show that Castana...possessed all the three ksatrapa titles.'

p 132, line 1-2—	*for*...	It is not unlikely that he was a subordinate ruler in the Avanti region under Gautamī-putra	*read*..	Later on he became a subordinate ruler under Gautamī-putra after his conquest of Aparānta and Avanti, but still, continued the use of Śaka era, as Bandhuvarman, a subordinate under Kumāra Gupta, used the Mālava era in the Mandasor record (*Select Ins.*, 299).
p. 141, line 1—	*for*	Vasudeva	*read*	Vāsudeva
p. 149, line 5	,,	mantra	,,	mantra

p. 185/217— Following earlier scholars I have placed Tivaradeva about 800 A.D. I am grateful to my friend B. P. Sinha for pointing out to me that on the revised opinion about the palaeography of the Sirpur record, scholars now generally agree in placing him in the 6th century A.D.

p. 188, line 31	*for*	Canapatināga	*read*	Ganapatināga
p. 191, line 2	,,	state	,,	states

p. 199-202— The discovery of an inscription referring to Mahārājādhirāja Rāma Gupta now solves a long standing problem and shows that there may be some truth in the account of the *Devī-Candraguptam*, though the details may not be wholly correct. D. C. Sircar now thinks that the palaeography of the

legends on Rāma Gupta's coins suggests a date in the fourth or fifth century A. D. (*Ep. Ind.*, xxxiii, 96), contrary to his earlier view that they should be assigned to the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century A.D. (*supra*, 202). If we take the earlier date, he may easily be regarded as an immediate predecessor of Candra Gupta II.

Another inscription on a bronze image found in the Banda District, U. P. contains the name of Harirāja. Can he be identified with Hari Gupta of the coins? Supporting the identification, D.C. Sircar thinks that like Indra Gupta, Harirāja=Hari Gupta issued the coins, 'on the decline of the Imperial authority of the Guptas in the outlying provinces of the Gupta empire about the close of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century A.D.' (*Studies in Indian Coins*, Delhi, 1968, 228). In a separate foot-note (*ib*, 229 fn), he suggests that 'it is not improbable that the so-called Later Guptas. . . were related to the family represented by the issuers of the copper coins discussed above,' showing that he is not very sure in his contention Evidently the existence of such princelings with names ending in Gupta led to the rise of different traditions on the duration of the Gupta rule (*infra*).

p. 227, fn. 20— If the tradition recorded by Jinasena is to be believed, the Gupta power came to an end in *c.* 551 A D. D.C. Sircar observes that 'there are two conflicting Jain traditions giving the duration of Gupta rule as 231 years and 255 years and pointing to its extinction respectively about 550 (—551 ?) A D and 574 (—575 ?) A.D. The first of these may refer to the extirpation of the Guptas from Bihar and U. P. and the second from Bengal and Orissa.' (*Select Ins.*[2], 490 *fn* 4). The Haraha inscription of 554 A.D. shows a Maukhari and not a Gupta as the Mahārājādhirāja of North India. (see p. 248-9 *supra*, for the extirpation of the Gupta rule before the rise of the Maukhari Mahārājādhirāja). As we are concerned here with the history of North India, we shall preferably be guided by the account of Jinasena, and not by the other one, if such a tradition is to be believed at all It is not unlikely that the second tradition centres round a king of Orissa with a Gupta surname claiming connection with the Imperial Guptas with the object of raising his family prestige, for there is hardly any evidence to show, except the Allahabad record of Samudra

Gupta, that any Imperial Gupta ruler ever conquered Orissa. In case of Samudra Gupta again it was a case of mere invasion and not annexation. One should be cautious to utilise uncorroborated Gupta traditions as recorded in later works. (see also *J. N. Sarkar Vol.*, ii, 343 ff).

p. 234— The Kauśāmbī seal which has *Toramāna* impressed on it and the account of Sungyun create some confusion regarding the extent of Toramāna's empire. It has already been pointed out that Mihirakula conquered the Gangetic valley after *c.* 518 A D., and hence the seal must have been carried to Kauśāmbī after that date, for there is absolutely no other evidence that Toramāna conquered the Gangetic valley The Eran inscription proves the extension of his empire into the interior of India. Sung-yun evidently knew nothing of it On the other hand, it is not unlikely that Toramāna's empire was lost for the time being and Mihirakula again conquered North India from the Epthalite base on the western side of the Indus.

p. 242, line 16 —	*for*	Shi-kia-fang-che	*read*	She-kia-fang-che
p. 271, line 32 —	,,	Thānesvar	,,	Thāneśvara
p. 274, line 17&18	,,	,,	,,	,,

p. 280, 299f. — A critic has raised the question, how could Śaśānka who was an enemy of Harṣa's family could have been entrusted with the rule of the Midnapore region and Orissa as a vassal under Harsa ? The critic seems to have missed the mark that the Ganjam record of 619 A.D., describes Śaśānka as Mahārājādhirāja, i.e , an independent king while the Midnapore record of 629 A D. shows that he was a subordinate ruler This was evidently due to the fact that Harsa defeated Śaśānka some time between 618 and 624 A D. (*supra*, 296) so far as it is determined by the Chinese sources. Thus while till 619 A D , Śaśānka's suzerainty extended upto Utkala-deśa in the south, later on he was confined to Bengal and Bihar as a subordinate ruler There is no question of a *chivalrous treatment* by Harsa towards Śaśānka as sarcastically the critic has remarked

p 301, line 26—	*for*	east	*read*	west
p. 303, line 31—	,,	Keilhorn	,,	Kielhorn
p. 304, line 1	,,	has	,,	have
,, ,,	,,	it	,,	them

GENEALOGICAL TABLES

I. *Śuṅga Dynasty*

1. Pusyamitra
2 Agnimitra
3 Sujyestha or Vasujyestha
4 Vasumitra (Sumitra)
} Bambika Kula (?)
5 Andhraka (? Bhadraka, Odraka, Ardraka, Antaka)
6. Pulindaka
7. Ghoṣa (or Ghoṣavasu)
8 Vajramitra
9 Bhāgavata or Bhāga
10 Devabhūmi or Devabhūti

II. *Kāṇva Dynasty*

1 Vāsudeva
2 Bhūmimitra
3 Nārāyaṇa
4 Suśarman

III *Śakas of Ki-pin*

1 Wu-tou-lao
2 Yin-mo-fu

IV. *Śakas of Taxila*

1 Maues
2 Azes
3 Azilises
4 Azes II

V. *Śakas of Seistan*

1 Vonones
2 Spalahora
3 Spalagadama
4 Spalirises
5 Azes (= Azes I of Taxila ?)

VI *Kusāṇas*

Group A

Kujula Kadphises I
Vima or Wema Kadphises II

Group B

Kaniska I
Vāsiska
Huviska
Kaniska II
Vāsudeva I
Kaniska III
Vāsudeva II

VII *Śakas of Western India*

Group A

(i) Bhūmaka (ii) Nahapāna

Group B

- Ysamotika
  - Caṣtana A.D. 130, c. 140
    - Jayadāman
      - Rudradāman, A.D. 130, 150
        - Dama(gh)jada Śrī I
          - Satyadāman
          - Jīvadāman A.D. 178(?), 197-8
        - Rudrasimha I, Satrap, A.D. 180, 188; Great Satrap A.D. 181-88, 191-96
          - Rudrasena I A.D. 200-22
            - Pṛthivīsena Satrap A.D. 222
            - Dāmajada Śrī II Satrap A.D. 232-3
          - Saṃghadāman A.D. 222-3
          - Dāmasena A.D. 223-6
            - Vīradāman Satrap A.D. 234-38
              - Rudrasena II A.D. 256(?)-76
                - Viśvasimha A.D. 278-82
                - Bhatṛdāman A.D. 282-95
                  - Viśvasena (Satrap) A.D. 293-304
            - Yaśodāman I A.D. 239
            - Vijayasena A.D. 239-50
            - Dāmajada Śrī III A.D. 251-5

Group C

Svāmī Jīvadāman

Rudrasımha II Satrap, A D 304

Yaśodāman II Satrap, A D 317-32

Group D

Rudradāman II

Rudrasena III A D 348-78 — Daughter

Sımhasena A D 382 — Satya Sımha

Rudrasena IV — Rudra Siṃha III A D 388 + x

VIII *Gupta Dynasty*

Śrī Gupta

Ghatotkaca Gupta

Candra Gupta I = Kumāradevī

Samudra Gupta = Dattadevī

Candra Gupta II = Dhruvadevī, Kuveranāgā

Govında Gupta — Kumāra Gupta I = Anantadevī — Prabhāvatī Guptā

Skanda Gupta — Puru Gupta = Srı Candrādevī — Ghatotkaca Gupta

Budha Gupta — Narasımha Gupta (Bālādıtya) = Mitradevī — Tathāgatarāja-Vaınya Gupta — Kumāra Gupta (of the Sarnath record)

Vajra — Kumāra Gupta II (Kramādıtya)

Vısnu Gupta (Candrāditya)

IX *Maukharis*

A. *Maukharis of Magadha*

Yajñavarman
|
Śārdūlavarman
|
Anantavarman

B. *The Main Branch*

Mahārāja Harivarman = Jayasvāminī
|
„ Ādityavarman = Harsaguptā
|
„ Iśvaravarman = Upaguptā
|
Mahārājādhirāja Iśānavarman = Laksmīvatī
|
„ Śarvavarman = Indrabhattārikā
|
„ Avantivarman =
|
├ „ Grahavarman = Rājyaśrī
└ Mahārājādhirāja Suva (?)

X *Later Guptas*

(*vide,* Ch VII. App. IV)

XI. *Puspabhūtis of Thāneśvara*

Mahārāja Naravardhana = Vajriṇīdevī
„ Rājyavardhana = Apsarādevī
„ Ādityavardhana = Mahāsenaguptādevī
Mahārājādhirāja Prabhākaravardhana = Yaśomatīdevī
|
├ *Mhdh.* Rājyavardhana
└ *Mhdh* Harṣavardhana

XII *Licchavis of Nepal*

A. Vṛsadeva
|
Śamkaradeva
|
Dharmadeva
|
Mānadeva
|
Mahīdeva
|
Vasanta-sena (-deva)

B Śivadeva I

C 1. Amśuvarman
2. Jisnugupta

XIII. *Kāmarūpa Kings*

(*vide* pp. 315f)

XIV *Gurjaras of Rajasthan*

Haricandra
|
Bhogabhata — Kakka — Rajjila — Dadda

Rajjila
|
Narabhaṭa
|
Nāgabhaṭa
|
Tāta — Bhoja

XV. *Gurjaras of Nāndipuri*

Dadda I
|
Jayabhaṭa I Vītarāga
|
Dadda II Praśāntarāga
|
Jayabhaṭa II
|
Dadda III Bāhusahāya

XVI. *Maitrakas of Valabhī*

- Senāpati Bhaṭāraka
  - Senāpati Dharasena I
  - Mahārāja Droṇasimha
  - Mahārāja Dhruvasena I
  - Mahārāja Dharapatta
    - Mahārāja Guhasena
      - Mahārājādhirāja Dharasena II
        - Mahārāja Śīlāditya I (Dharmāditya)
          - Derabhata
            - Śīlāditya II
              - Śīlāditya III
            - Kharagraha II (Dharmāditya)
            - Dhruvasena III
        - Kharagraha I
          - Dharasena III
          - Dhruvasena II
            - Dharasena IV

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTERS I & II

i. PUSYAMITRA AND THE BACTRIAN GREEKS
ii. THE AGE OF POLITICAL DISINTEGRATION

Original Sources

PRIMARY TEXTS

(i) *Greek and Latin*

Arrian, *Anabasis* & *Indica* (Eng. Tr), E J Chinnock, (London, 1893)

McCrindle, *Ancient India as Described in Classical Literature* (Westminster, 1901)

McCrindle, *Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy,* ed S N Majumdar. (Calcutta, 1927)

McCrindle, *The Invasion of India by Alexander the Great* as Described by Arrian, Q Curtius, Diodorus, Plutarch and Justin (Westminster, 1896)

Periplus Maris Erythraei (Eng Tr), W. H Schoff, (London, 1912)

Strabo, *Geographica* (Eng Tr), H C Hamilton & W Falconer. (London, 1889-90)

English Translations of the various Classical authors in the Loeb Classical Library Series, (London & New York)

(ii) *Tibetan*

Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism,* Tr. by F A. Von Schiefner (*Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien*) St Petersburg, 1869 (Eng Tr.) *IHQ,* iii, 1927

(iii) *Indian*

Arthaśāstra of Kautilya (ed) R Shama Sastri, Mysore, 1909, T Ganapati Sastri, 3 Vols (Trivendrum, 1924-5), Julius Jolly & R Schmidt (Lahore, 1923-4)

Arthaśāstra (Eng Tr) R Shama Sastri (Bangalore, 1950)

Divyāvadāna (ed) E B Cowell and A A Neil (Cambridge, 1886)

Harivamśa (ed) R Kinjawadekar (Poona, 1936)

Harsacarita of Bāna (Eng Tr) E. B. Cowell and F W Thomas (London, 1897)

Harsacarita of Bāna (ed) Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara (Calcutta, 1892)

Harsacarita of Bāna (ed) A Fuhrer (Bombay, 1909)

Jain Sūtras (Eng Tr) H. Jacobi, SBE xxii, xlv (Oxford, 1884-95)

Jain *Pattavalis,* IA, xi, xix, xx, xxi, xxiii

Mahābhārata (ed) Sukthankar and others (Poona, 1927-50)
Mahābhārata (ed.) N Siromani (Calcutta, 1834-39)
Mahābhāṣya (ed) F Kielhorn, 3 Vols. (Bombay, 1880-5)
Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa (Bombay, 1907)
Milindapañha, (ed) V. Trenckener and R. Chalmers (London, 1880) ; (Eng Tr), T. W. Rhys Davids, SBE 35 & 36 (Oxford, 1890-94)
Purāna Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, (ed) F. E. Pargiter (Oxford, 1913)

Rājataranginī, (ed) M. A Stein (Bombay, 1892), Eng Tr. by the same. (Westminster, 1900) ; Eng Tr by R S Pandit. (Allahabad, 1935)
Yugapurāna (ed) D. R. Mankad. (Vallabh Vidyanagar, 1951 ; Jayaswal, JBORS, xiv)

INSCRIPTIONS

Ayodhyā Stone Inscription of Dhanadeva. (*Ep. Ind.*, xx. p. 57 ; *Select Ins*, p. 96)
Bajaur Casket Inscription of the Reign of Menander (*Ep Ind* xxiv & xxvi)
Barhut Buddhist Pillar Inscription of the Time of the Śunga (Barua and Sinha, *Barhut Inscriptions*)
Besnagar Garuda Pillar Inscription of the Time of Bhāgabhadra—Regnal Year 14. (*ASIR*, 1908-9; *Select Ins* p 96)
Mora Brick Inscription of the Time of Bahasatimita (*JRAS*, 1912, p 120)
Pabhosā Cave Inscriptions of the Time of Udāka—Regnal Year 10 (*Ep Ind* ii pp. 242f, *Select Ins* pp 97-8)
Ghosūṇḍī Stone Inscription (of King Sarvatāta), (*Select Ins*, pp. 91-2)
Swāt Relic Vase Inscription of the Meridarkh Theodoros (CII, II, i, p 4, *Select Ins.* p. 109)
Hāthīgumphā Inscription of King Khāravela (*Ep. Ind* xx pp. 72f; *IHQ* xiv pp 261ff; IA, 1919)
Bodh-Gaya Inscriptions (*IHQ,* vi pp. 1ff)
Minor Old Brahmi Inscriptions in Udayagiri and Khandagiri Caves, (*IHQ,* xiv.)

COINS

Allan, J, *British Museum Catalogue of the Coins of Anciest India* (London, 1936)
"Indian Coins, Second Known and Best Preserved Stater of Menander (Gold)". (*British Museum Quarterly* xiv 1940, p 98, pl xxxiv)
Altekar, A. S, "New Kings and Interesting Coin Types from Kauśāmbī", (*JNSI,* i 1939)
"Pañcāla Coins", (*JNSI,* ii, iii, v)
Cunningham, A, *Coins of Ancient India* (London, 1891)
Deb, H K, "New Views in Indo-Greek Numismatics', (*JNSI,* i)

Gardner, P., *British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India* (London, 1886)
Ghosh, A., "Coins of Varuṇamitra at Ahichchhatra", (*JNSI*, v)
Ghosh, B., "Some Śuṅga Coins, hitherto misread", (*IC* v)
Haughton, H L., "Some Rare Indo-Greek Hemīdrachmas from the North-Western Frontier", (*JNSI*, iv)
Jayaswal, K P., "Six Unique Silver Coins of the Śuṅgas", (*JBORS*, xx)
Rapson, *Indian Coins* (Strassburg, 1898)
"Coins of the Graeco-Indian Sovereigns Agathocleia, Strato I Soter, and Strato II Philopater" (*Carolla Numismatica, Numismatic Essays in Honour of B V. Head* Oxford, 1906)
Sohni, S. V., "A Note on Audumbara Temple Coins", (*JNSI*, iv)
Smith, V A., *Catalogue of Coins in the Indian Museum,* Calcutta, i. (Oxford, 1906)
Whitehead, R B., *Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum,* i. (Oxford, 1914)
"The Dynasty of General Aśpavarman", (*NC*, 1944)
"Notes on the Indo-Greek Numismatics", (*NC*, 1923)
"Notes on the Indo-Greeks", (*NC*, 1940)
"Notes on the Indo-Greeks", (*NC*, 1947)

Modern Works

Banerjea, *Development of Hindu Iconography* (Calcutta, 1941)
Barua, B M., *Gaya and Buddha Gaya* (Calcutta, 1934)
Bhārhut, (Calcutta, 1934)
Bevan, *The House of Seleucus I,* (London, 1902)
Ghosh, N. N., *Early History of Kauśāmbī,* (Allahabad, 1935)
Gopalachari, K., *Early History of the Andhra Country,* (Madras, 1941)
Jayaswal, K P., *Hindu Polity,* (Calcutta, 1924)
Jouveau-Dubreuil, G., *Ancient History of the Deccan,* (Pondicherry, 1920
Law, B C., *Tribes in Ancient India,* (Poona, 1943)
Narain, A. K., *The Indo-Greeks,* (Oxford, 1962)
Rapson, E J., "The Purānas". (*CHI*, I, pp. 296-318)
"Indian Native States after the period of the Maurya Empire", (*CHI*, I, pp 514-538)
"The Successors of Alexander the Great", (*CHI*, I pp 540-62)
Rawlinson, H. G., *Bactria,* (London, 1912)
Raychaudhuri, H C., *Political History of Ancient India,* (Calcutta, 1950)
Sen, B C., *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal,* (Calcutta, 1942)
Tarn, W. W., *The Greeks in Bactria and India,* (Cambridge, 1938)
Vallée Poussin, Louis de la, *L'Inde Aux Temps des Mauryas etc* (Paris, 1930)

Select Articles in Periodicals

Bachofer, L., "On Greeks and Śakas in India", (*JAOS*, 1941)
Bagchi, P C, "Presidential Address, Section I", (*PIHC*, 1943)
"Kṛimīśa and Demetrius", (*IHQ*, xxii, 1946)
Balasubrahmanya, Ayyar, K., "The Memorable Message of Heliodorus", (*JOR*, xv, 1945-46)
Barnett, L D, "Another Ancient Tribe of the Punjab", (*BSOS*, xx. 1939-42)
Barua, B. M., "Khāravela as King and Builder", (*JISOA*, 1947)
Chanda, R P, "Puṣyamitra and the Śuṅga Empire", (*IHQ*, 1939)
Ghosh, J C, "The Caste of the Śungas", (*IHQ*, 1939)
Ghosh, N N, "The Parivrājaka and the Kānvāyana Kings", (*ABORI*. xix)
Jackson, V H, "Appendix B to K P Jayaswal's Article on Hāthigumphā Inscription", (*JBORS*, iii)
Jayaswal, K P, "Early Signed Coins of India", (*JBORS*, xx)
"Historical Data in the Gārgī Samhitā and the Brāhmin *Empire*—The Yuga Purāna", (*JBORS*, xiv)
"Revised Notes on the Brāhmin Empire" (*JBORS*, 1918)
Johnston, E H, "Demetrius in Sind" (*JRAS*, 1939)
Law, B. C, "A Note on Some Ancient Indian Tribes", (*NIA*, i)
Majumdar, R C, "Some Observations on Pusyamitra Śunga and his Empire (*IHQ*, i)
Marshall, J H, "Greeks and Śakas", (*JRAS*, 1947)
Raychaudhuri, H C, "A Note on the Lineage of Pusyamitra" (*IC*, iii)
"Observations on certain Post-Mauryan Dynasties" (*IC*, vi)
Tarn, W. W., "Demetrius in Sind", (*JRAS*, 1940)
Upadhyaya, B. C, "The River Sindhu of the Mālavikāgnimitram" (*JUPHS*, 1941)

CHAPTERS III TO V

iii THE ŚAKAS AND THE PARTHIANS
iv. THE KUSANAS
v. THE ŚAKAS OF WESTERN INDIA

Original Sources

PRIMARY TEXTS

(1) *Greek and Latin*

Besides those mentioned on Chs i and ii, the following may be noted:

Justin's *Epitoma Historicarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi* (Eng. Tr.) (J. S Watson, Bohn Classical Library
Isidors' *Parthian Stations*, (Eng Tr) W H. Schoff (Philadelphia, 1914)

Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles ii. W. Wright (London, 1871)
(ii) *Indian and Tibetan*
For Indian and Tibetan Sources see Bibliography to *Chs* i-ii
(iii) *Chinese Sources*
For an account of the Chinese sources, vide, *Supra,* pp. 60-1
INSCRIPTIONS
All the important "Kharosthī" inscriptions discovered upto 1928 have been edited by Sten Konow in his *CII,* ii(1), (Calcutta, 1928) Tre following, however, may be specially noted·

Śakas of Taxila

Shahdaur inscription of Damijəda, (*CII,* ii(1), p 14-16)
Mānshera inscription of the year 68, (*Ep Ind,* xxi, p 257)
Taxila Copper-plate inscription of Patika-year 78, (*Ep. Ind,* iv, pp 55f; *CII,* ii(1), p 28)

Śaka Satraps of Mathurā

Mathurā Lion Capital inscriptions of the time of Rañjubula and Śodāsa, (*Ep Ind,* ix, p 141; *CII,* ii(1), p 48)
The Mathurā Votive Tablet of the time of Śodāsa—Year 72, (*Ep Ind.,* ii, p 199; ix, pp 243-4)
Mathurā Stone inscription of the time of Śodāsa, (*Ep Ind,* ix, p 247)

Gondopharnes

The Takht-i-Bāhī Stone inscription of the year 103—regnal year 26 (*CII,* ii(1), p. 62, *Ep Ind* xviii, p 282)

The Early Kusānas

Panjtār Stone inscription of a Kusāna King—Year 122 (*Ep Ind,* xiv, p 134, *CII,* ii(1), p 70)
Kalawān Copper-plate inscription—Year 134 (*Ep. Ind,* xxi, p 259)
Taxila Silver scroll inscription of a Kusāna king—Year 136 (*CII,* ii(i), p 77; *Ep Ind,* xiv, p 295)

KANISKA GROUP OF KINGS
Kaniska I

Kosam inscription of the year 2, (*Ep Ind,* xxiv)
Sārnāth Buddhist Image inscription—Year 3 (*Ep Ind.,* vii, pp 173ff)
British Museum Stone inscription—Year 10 (*Ep. Ind,* ix, p 240)
Sui Vihār C P. inscription Year 11 (*CII,* ii(1), p 141)

Zeda inscription—year 11 (*Ep Ind*, xix, pp 1ff, *CII*, ii(1), p 145)
Mānikiāla stone inscription—Year 18 (*CII*, ii(1), pp 149f)
Two inscriptions from Set-Mahet, (*Ep Ind*, viii, pp 180f; ix, p 291)
Kurram Copper casket inscription—Year 21, (*CII*, ii(1), p. 155; *Ep. Ind*, xviii, pp 15ff)

Vāsiṣka

Sāñchi Buddhist Image inscription—year 28 (*Ep Ind*, ii, pp. 369-70)
Isāpur inscription, (*Luders* No 139a)

Huviṣka

Mathurā Stone inscription—Year 28, (*Ep Ind*, xxi, p. 60)
Mathurā Buddhist Image inscription—Year 33, (*Ep. Ind.*, viii, pp 181f)
Mathurā Jain Image inscription—Year 44, (*Ep Ind*, i, p 387, No. 9; ii, p 212, n. 37, x, p 114, No 7)
Lucknow Museum inscription—Year 48, (*Ep Ind*, x, p 112, No 5)
Mathurā Buddhist Image inscription—Year 51, (*Ep Ind*, x, p. 113, No 6)
Wardak Bronze Vase inscription—Year 51 (*CII*, ii(1), p. 170)

Kaṇiṣka II

Ārā Stone inscription—Year 41 (*CII*, ii(1), p 165, *Ep Ind*, xiv, p 143)

Vāsudeva

Mathurā inscriptions—Year 80, (*Ep. Ind*, i, p. 392, no. 24, x, p 116, no. 10)
Mathurā Image Inscription of the year 64 or 67, (*Ep Ind*, xxx, Part V, pp 181ff)

ŚAKAS OF WESTERN INDIA

Six Nāsik Cave inscriptions of the time of Nahapāna, (*Ep Ind*, viii)
Kārle Cave inscriptions of the time of Nahapāna, (*Arch Surv. West Ind*, iv, p 101, *Ep. Ind*, vii, pp 57ff, no. 13)
Junnār Cave inscription of the time of Nahapāna—Year 46 (*Arch Surv West Ind*, iv, p 103)
Andau Stone inscription of the time of Castana and Rudradāman I (Śaka) year 52, (*Ep. Ind*, xii, pp 23ff)
Junāgadh Rock inscription of Rudradāman I (Śaka) Year 72, (*Ep Ind*, viii, pp. 42ff)

The following inscriptions may also be noted in this connection
Copper Seal Ring inscription of Śivasena (*CII*, ii(1), p 103)

Charsadda Kharosthī inscription of the year 303 (*Acta Orientalia*, xx, 1947)
Kabul Museum Stone inscription of the year 83 (*Acta Orientalia*, xvi)
Allahabad Museum inscription of the year 87 (*Ep. Ind*, xxiii, p. 245)
Taxila Silver Vase inscription of Jihonika—year 191—(*CII*, ii(i), p 82)

Coins

Acharya, G V., "Two Notes on Western Kshatrapa and Valabhī Coins", (*JRASB*, Nam Suppl Lxvii, pp. 93f)
Allan, J, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, (London, 1936)
Banerjea, J. N., "The Title Devaputra of Kuyula Kara Kadphises Coins", (*JNSI*, ix)
Banerjee R D, "Notes on Indo-Scythian Coinage", (*JASB*(*NS*) 1908)
Bhandarkar, D R, "Kshatrapa Coins from Sarvania", (*ASIR*, 1913-4)
Cunningham, A, "*Coins of Indo-Scythians and Kushānas*" (London, 1892-4)
Gadre, A S., "Important coins from the Baroda State (Kshatrapa)" (*JNSI*, i)
Gardner, P, *British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Greek and Scythic kings of Bactria and India*, (London, 1886)
Rapson, E J, *Catalogue of Coins of the Andhra Dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the Traikutaka Dynasty and the Bodhi Dynasty*, (London, 1908)
Sankalia, H D, "A Rare Gold coin of Huviska" (*JNSI*, i)
Smith, V A, *Catalogue of coins in the Indian Museum*, Calcutta, i, (Oxford, 1906)
Whinfild, E H, "The Nasik Hoard of Nahapāna's Coins" (*JRAS*, 1908)
Whitehead, R B, *Catalogue of Coins in the Punjab Museum*, i, (Oxford, 1914)

Modern Works

Chattopadhyaya, S, *The Śakas in India* (1955)
Ghirshman, R, *Recherches Archaeologiques et Historiques sur les Kouchans, Memoires de la Délegation archaeotogique francaise en Afganistan*, Tome xii (Cairo, 1946)
Leeuw, Von Lohuizen-de, *The Scythian Period* (Leiden, 1949)
Rapson, E J, "The Scythian and Parthian Invaders" *CHI*, i Ch xxiii
Nilakanta Sastri, K A, *A Comprehensive History of India*, chs vii-ix (Calcutta, 1957)
Raychaudhuri, H C, *Political History of Ancient India* (5th edition) (Calcutta, 1950)
Sen, B C, *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal* (Calcutta, 1942)
Tarn, W W, *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge, 1951)

Articles in Periodicals

Bachhofer, L, "On Greeks and Śakas in India", (*JAOS*, 1941)
Bailey, H W, "Kanishka (Khotan Legend)", (*JRAS*, 1942)
Banerjee R D, "Nahapāna and the Śaka Era", (*JRAS*, 1917 and 1925)
Bhandarkar, D. R, "Indo-Parthian Dynasty of Vonones", (*IC*, viii)
Gupta, P L., "Eastern Expansion of the Kushāna Empire", (*IHQ*, **xxix**)
Jayaswal, "The Statue of 'Wema Kadphises and Kushāna Chronology", (*JBORS*, vi)
Konow, Sten, "Notes on Indo-Scythian Chronology", (*JIH*, xii)
"Dr Banerjee on Śakas and Kushānas", (*IHQ*, xiv)
Lévi, S, "Notes on the Indo-Scythians", (*Ind Ant* 1903)
"Kanishka et Sātavāhana", (*JA*, 1936)
Marshall, J H, "Greeks and Śakas", (*JRAS*, 1947)
Pai, M Govind, "Were Hermaues and Kujula Kadphises Joint Rulers?", (*NIA*, i)
Sastri, K. N, "The Later Sātavāhanas and Śakas", (*JRAS*, 1926)
Smith, V A, "The Indo-Parthian Dynasties", (*ZDMG*, 1906)
"The Śakas in Northern India", (*ZDMG*, 1907)
Thomas, F W, "Sakasthana", (*JRAS*, 1906)
"Sandanes, Nahapāna, Chastana and Kanishka", (*NIA*, 1944 (vii)
"Devaputra," (*B. C Law Vol* ii), (Poona, 1946)

CHAPTER VI

VI THE DARK AGE

Original Sources

PRIMARY TEXTS

Bṛhatsaṁhitā, (ed) J. H K Kern, (Calcutta, 1865)
Harivaṁśa, (Calcutta, 1830-35)
Purāna Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, (ed) F E Pargiter, (Oxford, 1913)

Mālavas and Yaudheyas

INSCRIPTIONS

Nandsa Yupa inscription of the year 282 V. E (*Ep Ind*, xxvi)
Vijayagadh Yupa inscription of the year 428 V E (*Corpus*, III, p 251)

Maukharis of Badvā

Badvā Yupa inscription of the year 295 V E (*Ep Ind*, xxiii, p. 42)
Badvā Yupa inscriptions, (*Ep Ind*, xxiv, p 251)

Magha kings

Bhīmasena

Ginja inscription of the year 52, (*Ep Ind*, iii, p 306)

Bhadra-Magha

Kosam Stone inscription of the year 81, (*Ep Ind*, xxiv, p 253)
Kosam Stone inscription of the year 86, (*Ep Ind*, xviii, p 160)
Allahabad Museum inscription of the year 87, (*Ep Ind*, xxiii, p 245)

Śiva-Magha

Kosam Stone inscription, (*Ep. Ind*, xviii, p 159)

Vaiśravana

Kosam Stone inscription of the year 107, (*Ep Ind.*, xxiv, p 146)

Bhīma-Varman

Kosam inscription of the year 130, (*IC*, iii, p. 177)
For other inscriptions of these kings, see *Ancient India*, no 5, p 52

Western Ksatrapas

Junāgadh inscription of Jīvadāman I, (*Ep Ind*, xviii, p 339)
Gundā inscription of Rudrasimha I of the year 103, (*Ep. Ind*, xvi, p 233)
Junāgadh inscription of Rudrasimha I, (*Ep. Ind.*, xvi, p. 239)
Mulwasar Tank inscription of the year 122, (*Bhavnagar Inscr* p. 2)
Jasdan inscription of the year 127 (6 ?), (*Ep Ind*, xvi, 236)
Watson Museum inscription of Rudrasimha II of the year 228, (*Watson Museum Report* for 1919-20, p 7)
Mulwasar inscription of Rudrasimha II of the year 232, (*Bhavnagar Inscr.* p. 23)
Basārh clay seal of Mahādevī Prabhudamā, (*ASIR*, 1913-4, p 136)
Sāñchī Museum inscription of Śaka Śrīdhara-varman of the year 241(?). (*JASB*, xix, p 341)
Mewasā Stone inscription, (*Watson Museum Report* for 1923-4, p 12)

Sassanid Kings

Paikuli · *Monument and Inscription of the Early History of the Sassanian Empire*, 2 Vols (Berlin, 1924) by Herzfeld

Bengal

Susunia inscription of king Candravarman, (*Ep Ind*, xii, p 317ff; xiii, p. 133)

COINS

Acharya, G. V, "Hoards of the coins of the Western Kshatrapas", (*JRASBL*, iii, *Num Suppl* xlvii, pp 95ff)

Allan, *Catalogue of the Coins of Ancient India in the British Museum*, (London, 1936)

Altekar, A. S, "New Nāga coins and the Identity of Bhavanāga", (*JNSI*, v pp. 21-26)

"Some Alleged Nāga and Vākāṭaka coins", (*JNSI*, v pp 111-34)

"Was Jīvadāman a Mahākshatrapa more than once?" (*JNSI*, i pp. 18-19)

"Inter-regnum in the reign of Mahākshatrapa Rudrasena", (*JNSI*, vi)

Banerjee, R D, "Notes on Indo-Scythian Coinage", (*JASB*, NS iv, pp 81-96)

Bhandarkar, D R, Kshatrapa Coins from Sarvānia (*ASIR*, 1913-14, pp 227ff)

Cunningham, A, Later Indo-Scythians, (London, 1893-4) (Reprinted from the Num Chron)

Herzfeld, Kushano-Sassanian Coins (*MASI*, No 38) (Calcutta, 1930)

Motichandra, "Hoard of Kauśāmbī Coins from Fatehpur" (*JNSI*, ii, pp 95ff)

Parruk, F J, *Sassanian Coins* (Bombay, 1924)

Rapson, E J, *Catalogue of the Indian coins of the Andhra Dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas etc in the British Museum* (London, 1908)

Modern Works

Banerjea, J N., *Development of Hindu Iconography*, (Calcutta, 1941)

Ghosh, N. N, *Early History of Kauśāmbī*, (Allahabad, 1935)

Jayaswal, *History of India*, A D, 150-350 (Lahore, 1933)

Hindu Polity, (Calcutta, 1924)

Law, B C., *Tribes in Ancient India*, (Poona, 1943)

Majumdar, R. C, & Altekar, A. S, *New History of the Indian People*, Vol VI, (Lahore, 1946)

Nilakanta Sastri, K A, *A Comprehensive History of India*, Vol II, (Calcutta, 1957)

Rapson, E J, *Cambridge History of India*, Vol I, ch xxxi (Cambridge, 1922)

Raychaudhuri, H C, *Political History of Ancient India*, 5th Edition, (Calcutta, 1950)

Sen, B. C, *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, (Calcutta, 1942)

Articles in Periodicals

Altekar, A S, "Who overthrew the Kushāna Empire The Bhāraśivas, the Vākātakas or the Yaudheyas?" (*POC*, 1943) "Maghas of South Kośala", (*Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute*, Allahabad, I, pp 149-60)

Banerji Sastri, A., "The Nāgas in the 3rd and the 4th centuries A D.", (*JRASB*, 1939)

Gupta, Miss K K, "Mr K P Jayaswal on the Bhāraśivas", (*IC*, I)

Law, B C, "A Note on some Ancient Indian Tribes", (*NIA*, I)

CHAPTER VII

vii THE GUPTAS

Original Sources

PRIMARY TEXTS

(i) *Indian*

Ārya-Mañjuśrī-mūla-Kalpa, (ed) T. Ganapati Sastri (TSS), (Trivandrum, 1925)

Devī-Candraguptam of Viśākhadatta

Kali-yugo-rāja-vrttānta, *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, by N Krishnamacharia (Madras, 1937) (pp liv-lvi)

Kaumudīmahotsava by Vijakā by Sakuntala Rao Sastri (Bombay, 1952)

Purāna Texts of the Dynasties of the Kali Age (ed) F E Pargitar (Oxford, 1913)

(ii) *Chinese*

Beal, S, *Si-yu-ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Tr from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsang, 2 Vols (London, 1906)

" *Life of Hiuen Tsang*

Chavannes, E, *Mémoire Composé á l' époque de la grande dynastie. T'ang sur les religieux Eminents qui allèrent chercher á loi dans les pays d'Occident* par I-tsing (Paris, 1894) A summary in English of this work is given in Beal's *Life*, Intr

Fa-hsien, *A Record of the Buddhist Countries*, (Eng. Tr) (Peking, 1957)

Giles, H A, *The Travels of Fa-hsien or Record of Buddhistic kingdoms*, (Cambridge, 1923)

Julien, S, *Mémoires Sur les contrées occidentales*, (Tr of Hiuen Tsang) (Paris, 1857-58)

Legge, J H, *Record of Buddhistic kingdoms*, (*Oxford*, 1886)

Takakusu, J. A, *Record of the Buddhistic Religion as practised in India and the Malaya Archipelago*, by I-Tsing, (Oxford, 1886)

Walters, T, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India* (ed) T. W. Rhys Davids and S. W. Bushell, 2 vols. (London, 1904, 1905)

Shi-kia-fang-che

(iii) *Tibetan*

Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism* Tr by F A Von Schiefner (Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indien). St Petersburg, 1869) (Eng. Tr.) IHQ, iii, 1927)

(iv) *Greek and Latin*

McCrindle, *Ancient India as described in Classical Literature*, (Westminster, 1901).

INSCRIPTIONS

Year	Find-place	Reference
—	*Mahārāja Gupta*	
	Clay seal inscription	*JRAS*, 1901, p 99; 1905, p 814
	Samudra Gupta	
—	Allahabad	*Corpus* III, p 1; *Ep Ind.*, xxii, p. 35; *IHQ*, i, p. 250; *JBORS*, xviii, p. 207; *JRAS*, 1935, p. 697
—	Eran	*Corpus* III, p. 18; *JIH*, xiv, p 27; xix, p. 27; *Select Ins.* p 260
5	Nalanda (CP)	*Ep. Ind*, xxv, p 52; xxvi, p. 135
9	Gayā (CP)	*Corpus* III, p 254; *IC*, x, p. 77; xi, p 225
	Chandra Gupta II	
61	Mathurā (P)	*Ep. Ind*, xxi, p 1; *IHQ*, p 271
	Regnal yr. 5	*ABORI*, xviii, p 166; *Select Ins.* p 269
82	Udayagiri (Cave)	*Cospus*, III, p. 21
88	Gadhwa (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 36
93	Sāñchī (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p 29
	Mathurā (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 25
	Udayagiri (Cave)	*Corpus*, III, p 34
	Basārh Clay Seals	*ASIR*, 1903-4, p 107
	Meharaulī (Iron Pillar)	*Corpus*, III, p 139
	Kumāra Gupta I	
96	Bilsad (Pillar)	*Corpus*, IIII, p 42
98	Gadhwa (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 40
106	Udayagiri (Cave)	*Corpus* III, p 258
113	Dhānāidaha (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xviii, p 347

Year	Find-place	Reference
113	Mathurā (Jain Image)	*Ep. Ind* ii, p. 210
116	Tumain (Stone)	*Ep. Ind*, xxvi, p. 115
117	Karamdāṇḍā (Brahmanical Image)	*Ep. Ind*, x, p. 71
120	Kūlaikuri (CP)	*IHQ*, xix, p 12
124	Dāmodarpur (CP)	*Ep. Ind*, xv, p 129
128	Dāmodarpur (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xv, p. 132, xvii, p 193
128	Baigrām (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xxi, p 78
129	Mankuwār (Buddhist Image)	*Corpus*, III, p 45
129	Gadhwa (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p 39
	Basārḥ Clay Seals (Ghatotkaca Gupta)	*ASIR*, 1903-4, p 107

Skanda Gupta

Year	Find-place	Reference
136-8	Junāgadh (Rock)	*Corpus*, III, p 56
141	Kahāum (Pillar)	*Corpus* III, p 65, *IHQ*, xxviii, p. 298
141	Rewa (Pillar)	*POC*, xii, Vol iii, p. 587
146	Indore (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 68
	Bhitari (Pillar)	*Corpus*, III, p 52
(V S 524)	Mandasor Fort Wall	*Ep Ind*, xxvii, p 12
—	Bihar Inscription of Skanda Gupta	*Corpus*, III, p 47; *IC*, x, p 170

Puru Gupta (?)

Year	Find-place	Reference
154	Sarnath (of Kumāra Gupta)	*ASIR*, 1914-5, p 124, *Select Ins* p 320

Budha Gupta

Year	Find-place	Reference
157	Sarnath	*ASIR*, 1914-15, p 125, *Select Ins* p 323
159	Paharpur (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xx, p 61
159	Benares (Rajghat)	*JRASBL*, xv, p 5
163	Damodarpur (CP)	*Ep. Ind*, xv, p 134; *Select Ins* p 324
165	Eran	*Corpus*, III, p 88
—	Damodarpur (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xv, p 138
—	Nālandā Seal	*MASI*, No 66, p 64, *IHQ*, xix, pp 119 and 272

Vainya Gupta

Year	Find-place	Reference
188	Gunaighar (CP)	*IHQ*, vi, p 40, *Select Ins* p 331
—	Nālandā Seal	*MASI*, No 66, p 67, *IHQ*, xix, p 275

Year	Find-place	Reference
	Bhānu Gupta	
191	Eraṇ (Pılar)	*Corpus*, III, p 91, *IHQ*, xıx, p 143; *Ep. Ind*, xxıı, p 16
	Kumāra Gupta II	
—	Bhıtarī Seal	*JASB*, lviii, p 89, *Select Ins* p 321
—	Nālandā Seal	*MASI*, No 66, p 66
224	Damodarpur (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xv, p. 142, *Select Ins* p 337
	Viṣnu Gupta	
—	Nālandā Seal	*Ep Ind*, xxvı, p. 235; *IHQ*, xıx, p 119

Inscrıptıons of Contemporary Rulers and Dynastıes

Year	Find-place	Reference
461	(V E) Nara-Varman, Mandasor (Stone)	*Ep Ind*, xii, p 315, xıv, p 371
474	(V E) Nara-Varman, Bıhar Kotra (Stone)	*Ep. Ind*, xxvı, p 130, *JBORS*, xxix, p 127
480	(V E) Vıśva-varman, Gangdhar (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 72
93 & 529	(V E) Bandhu-varman, Mandasor (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p 79
156	Hastın, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 93
158	Lakṣmana, Sıngraulı (CP)	*ASIR*, 1936-7, p 88
158	Laksmana, Palı (CP)	*Ep Ind*, ii p 364
163	Hastın, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus* III, p. 100
167	Subandhu, Barwanı (CP)	*Ep Ind.*, xıx, p 262, *IHQ*, xxi, p 81
170	Hastın, Jabalpur	*Ep Ind*, xxvııı, pp 264ff
191	Sarvanātha, Sohaval (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xıx, p 129
198	Hastın, Navagram (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xxi, p. 124
199	Samksobha, Betul (CP)	*Ep Ind*, vııı, p 284
209	Samksobha, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 112
—	Hastın and Sarvanātha, Bhumara (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 110, *IHQ*, xxı, p 137
174	Jayanātha, Karıtalaı (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 117
177	Jayanātha, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 121
191	Sarvanātha, Sohaval (CP)	*Ep Ind*, xıx, p 129
193	Sarvanātha, Khoh (CP3	*Corpus*, III, p 125
197	Sarvanātha, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 132
214	Sarvanātha, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 135
—	Sarvanātha, Khoh (CP)	*Corpus*, III, p 129

250	Prthivīvigraha, Sumaṇḍala (CP)	*IHQ*, xxvi, p. 75
589	(V E) Yaśodharman, Mandasor (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 152
—	Yaśodharman, Mandasor (Pillar)	*Corpus*, III, p 146

Epthalite kings

—	Toramāna Sahi, Kurā (Stone)	*Ep Ind.*, i, p. 329; *Select Ins*, p. 398
1	Toramāna, Eraṇ (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p. 159
15	Mihirakula, Gwalior (Stone)	*Corpus*, III, p 162
		Bhandarkar's list No. 2109; *Select Ins*, p 400

Kings of Bengal

Faridpur Copper-plate inscription of Dharmāditya of the year 3—(*Ind Ant.* xxxix, p. 195)

Faridpur Copper-plate inscription of the time of Dharmāditya—(*Ind Ant* xxxix, p 200)

Faridpur Copper-plate inscription of the time of Gopacandra of the year 18—(*Ind Ant* xxxix, p. 204)

Mallasārul Copper-plate of Gopacandra—(*Ep. Ind*, xxiii, pp. 155-61)

Ghugrahati Copper-plate of the reign of Samācāradeva of the year 14—(Preserved in the Dacca Museum)

Kurapāla inscription of the reign of Samācāradeva of the year 7—(Details not known)

Nālandā Seal of Samācāradeva—(*MASI*, No. 66, p 31)

The Maukharis of Magadha

Barabar Hill cave inscription of Anantavarman, (*Corpus*, III, p. 221)

Two Nagarjuni Hill cave inscriptions of Anantavarman, (*ib*, pp. 233, 226)

COINS

Allan J, *Catalogue of the coins of the Gupta Dysasties and Śasāmka, King of Gauda* (in the British Museum), London, 1914)

Altekar, A. S., *Bāyana Hoard of Gupta Coins*

"Asvamedha coins of Samudra Gupta" (*Bhārata Itihāsa Samśodhaka Mandala* Quarterly, Special Number, 1948, pp 1-7)

"Attribution of Chandragupta-Kumāradevī type", (*JRASB*, 1937), *Num Suppl.*, xlvii, pp 105ff)

"Bāyana Hoard of the Gupta coins", (*JNSI* viii, pp 179-84)

Bayle, E. C, "Notes on Gupta coins", (*Ind. Ant* vi, pp 57-8)

Brown, C. J., Catalogue of the coins of the Guptas, Maukharis etc in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow (Allahabad, 1920)

Bhattasali, N. K, "Notes on Gupta Coins" (*JASB*, NS, No 37, pp. 54-64)
Cunningham, A., *Coins of Ancient India from the Earliest Times down to the seventh century A.D*, (London, 1891)
Gupta, P. L., "The coins of the Kidāra-Kushanas", (*JRASBL*, III, *Num Suppl* xlvii, pp 23ff)
Martin, M. F C. "Coins of the Kidāra-Kushanas," (*JRASBL*, III, Num *Suppl* xlvii, pp ff).
Mookerji, R K., "Some contributions on Gupta coinage", (*B C Law Volume*, I, pp 164-9)
Narain, A. K, "Budha Gupta and his Gold Coins", (*JNSI*, xii, pp 112-5)
Rapson, E. J, Indian coins, (Strassburg, 1897)
Catalogue of the coins of the Andhra dynasty, the Western Kshatrapas, the *Traikūṭaka dynasty and the Bodhi dynasty* (Cat. of Indian coins in the British Museum, vol. iv) (London, 1908)
Saraswati, S K, "A Gold coin of Budhagupta", (*IC*, i, pp 691-2)
Sastri, Hirananda, "The Aśvamedha coins of Samudragupta", (*JASB, NS*, No. xi, pp 447-78)
Sinha, B. P, "Bearing of Numismatics on the History of the Later Imperial Guptas', (*JBRS*, xxxiv, pp 18-26)
Smith, V A, *Catalogue of the coins in the Indian Museum*, Calcutta, (Oxford, 1906))
"The coinage of the Early or Imperial Gupta dynasty" (*JRAS*, 1889, pp 1-141)
"Observations on Gupta coinage", (*JRAS*, 1893, pp 77-148)

SECONDARY TEXTS

Abhijñāna Śakuntalam of Kālidāsa (HOS, 1922)
Mālavikāgnimitram „ „ (Bombay, 1907)
Meghadūtam „ „ (Benares, 1931)
Raghuvamśam „ „ (Bombay, 1897)
Mānavadharmaśāstra, (ed) G Jha, 5 Vols (Calcutta, 1922-9)
Baudhāyana Dharmasūtra
Gautama Dharmasūtra
Rājataranginī, Kalhana, (ed) M A. Stein (Bombay, 1892)
(Eng Tr) by the same (Westminster, 1900)
(Eng Tr) by R S Pandit (Allahabad, 1935)

Modern Works

Aiyangar, S Krishnaswami, *Studies in Gupta History*, (Madras, 1928)
Banerjee, R D, *The Age of the Imperial Guptas*, (Benares, 1933)
Dandekar, R N, *A History of the Guptas*, (Poona, 1941)
Mehta, G P, *Chandragupta Vikramāditya* (in Hindi) (Allahabad, 1932,
Mookerjee, R K, *The Gupta Empire*, (Bombay, 1948)
Saletore, R N, *Life in the Gupta Age*, (Bombay, 1943)

Shastri, Raghunandana, *Guptavamsakā Itihāsa* (in Hindi) (Lahore, 1932)
Shembavnekar, K M, *The Glamour about the Guptas* (Bombay, 1953)
Upadhyaya, B S, *Gupta Sāmrajyakā Itihāsa* (in Hindi), 2 vols (Allahabad 1939)

Articles in Periodicals

Altekar, A S, "A New Gupta king", (*JBORS*, xiv, pp 223-53)
"Further Discussion about Rāmagupta", (*JBORS*, xv, pp. 141-181)
Banerji, R D, "Chronology of the Late Imperial Guptas", (*ABORI*, i, pp 67-80)
Bhandarkar, D R, "Govinda-gupta and Puru-gupta", (*IC*, xi, p 231)
"Identification of the Princes and Territories mentioned in the Allahabad Pillar Inscription of Samudra-gupta", (*IHQ*, i, pp 250ff)
"New Light on the Early Gupta History," (*Malaviya Comm. Vol*, pp 189-211)
Bhattacharya, B, "New Light on the History of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty", (*JBRS*, xxx, pp 1-46)
Chhabra, B Ch, "Allahabad Inscription of Samudra-gupta is not posthumous", (*IHQ*, xxiv, pp. 104-13)
Das Gupta, N N, "Kācha Problem", (*IHQ*, xx, pp 351-3)
"On the Successors of Kumāra-gupta I," (*B C. Law Vol* i pp 617-25)
Ganguly, D C, "Early Home of the Imperial Guptas," (*IHQ*, xiv pp. 532ff)
"The Original Home of the Imperial Guptas," (*IHQ*, xviii, pp 386ff)
Ghosh, A, "Nālandā Seals of Budha-gupta and Vishnu-gupta," (*IHQ*, xix, pp 119-25)
Gupta, P L, "Ghatotkacha-gupta," (*IHQ*, xxii, pp 316-29)
"Kācha Problem solved", (*IHQ*, xxii, pp 60-1)
"Kācha A step-brother of Samudra-gupta", (*JNSI*, v pp 33-36)
Heras H, "Relations between the Guptas, Kadambas and Vākātakas", (*JBORS*, xii, pp 455ff)
"Two Controversial points in the Reign of Samudra-gupta", (*ABORI*, ix, pp 83-90)
Jagan Nath., "Are Skanda-gupta and Puru-gupta Identical?" (*Bhāratiya Vidyā*, viii, pp 7-10)
"Govinda-gupta, a New Gupta Emperor", (*IHQ*, xxii, pp 286-90)
"Identification of Budha-gupta with Puru-gupta', (*Bhāratiya Vidyā*, vi, pp 235-6)
Majumdar, R. C, "Bihar Stone Pillar Inscription of Skanda-gupta," (*IC*, x pp 170-173)
"Forged Purana-text on the Imperial Guptas," (*IHQ*, xx pp 345-50)
"Gayā and Nālandā Plates of Samudra-gupta", (*IC*, xi, pp 225-30)
"Original Home of Imperial Guptas," (*JBRS*, xxxviii, p 410)
"Revised chronology of the last Gupta Emperors", (*IA*, xlvii, pp 161-7)

"Seal of Vainya-gupta", (*IHQ*, xxiv, p 67)
"Successors of Kumāra-gupta," (*JASB, NS*, xvii, pp 249-55)
"The successors of Skanda-gupta," (*JUPHS*, xviii, pp 70ff)
Mirashi, V V., "Were the Mahārājas of Khandesh the Feudatories of the Guptas"? (*IHQ*, xxiii, pp. 156ff)
Raychaudhuri, H C, "The Successors of Kumāra-gupta I", (*IHQ*, viii, p 352)
Saletore, B. A, "Samudragupta's conquest of Kottura," (*ABORI*, xxvi, p 120-141)
Sharma, D, "The Śaka rival of Rāma-gupta," (*IC*, v pp. 328-30)
Sinha, B P, "Bearing of Numismatics on the History of the Imperial Guptas," (*JBRS*, xxxiv, Parts III-IV)
"Kumāra-gupta III". (*JBRS*, xxxvi, Parts III-IV)
Sircar, D. C, "Gupta Rule in Orissa," (*IHQ*, pp 75ff)

CHAPTERS VIII & IX

viii THE RISE OF THE MAUKHARIS
ix. THE AGE OF HARSA

Original Sources

PRIMARY TEXTS

See Bibliography to Chapter VII —also,
Harṣacarita (ed) Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara, (Calcutta, 1892)
„ (ed) Fuhrer (Bombay, 1909)
„ (Eng Trans) by Cowell and Thomas (1897)
Bana's Kādambarī (Eng Trans) by Ridding (London, 1896)

Maukharis

INSCRIPTIONS

Asirgarh seal of Śarvavarman, (*Corpus*, III, p 219)
Jaunpur inscription of Īśvaravarman, (*Corpus*, III, p 228)
Haraha inscription of Īśānavarman, (*Ep Ind*, xiv, pp 110-120)
Nālandā Seal of Śrī Su . , (*Ep Ind*, xxiv, p 224)

Later Guptas

Aphsad inscription of Ādityasena, (*Corpus*, III, p 200)
Deo-Bāranark inscription of Jīvitagupta, II. (*ib* p 213)

Śaśānka

Rohtasgadh Seal-matrix. (*Corpus*, III, p 283)
Two Copper-plates of Śaśānka from Midnapore (*JRASBL*, xi, pp. 1-9)
Ganjam Plates of the year 300, (*Ep Ind*, vi, pp 143ff)

Harṣavardhana

Banskhera Copper-plate, (*Ep Ind*, iv, pp 208-11)
Madhuban Copper-plate, (*Ep Ind*, i, pp. 67-75)
Nālandā Seals (*Ep Ind*, xxi, pp 74-6)
Sonpat Seal, (*Corpus*, III, p 231)

Kāmarūpa Kings

For inscriptions of the Kāmarūpa kings see Bhattacharya, Padmanath, *Kāmarūpaśāsanāvalī*, (in Bengali), (Rangpur, 1931) And also the following records —
Doobi C P Inscriptions, (*JARS*, xii, p. 16)
Nālandā Seals, (*MASI*, No 66, *JBORS*, v pp 302-4; vi, pp 151-2)
Nidhānpur C P inscription, (*Ep Ind*, xii, pp 65-9, xix, pp 115ff)

Nepal Kings

For inscriptions see:
Bendall, C, *Journey in Nepal and Northern India* (Cambridge, 1886)
Bhagavanlal Indraji, "Inscriptions from Nepal" (*Ind Ant.*, 1880, pp 163-193)
Levi, S, "Anciennes Inscriptions du Népal", (*JA*, 1907, pp 49-114)
Le Népal, Vol III (Paris, 1908)

Valabhī kings

See Bhandarkar's List, Nos 1717, 1289-1375
Virdi C P grant of Kharagraha, (*POC*, vii, pp 659ff)

Gurjara kings

Five Ghatiyala inscriptions of Kakkuka, (*JRAS*, 1895, pp 513ff *Ep Ind* ix, pp 277ff)
Jodhpur inscription of Bauka of the year 894, (*Ep Ind*, xviii, pp 87ff)
For the inscriptions of the Gurjara kings of Broach, see *Bhandarkar's List*, Nos 1209-1213, 1218-19, also *Ep. Ind.*, xxiii, pp 147ff; xxv pp. 292ff
Kaira Grant, (*Ind. Ant*, xiii, pp 82ff)
Nausari Grant, (*Ind Ant*, xiii, pp 77-9)
Coins
Allan, *Catalogue of the coins of the Gupta Dynasties and of Śaśāṅka, king of Gauḍa* (in the British Museum), (London, 1914)
Barn "Some coins of the Maukharis and of the Thanesvar line." (*JRAS*, 1906, pp 453f)
Catalogue of the coins of the Guptas, Maukharis etc in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow (Allahabad, 1920)

Bendall, C, "On some Nepalese coins in the Library of the German Oriental Society", (*ZDMG*, xxxvi, pp 651-2)

Cunningham, A, Ancient coinage of Kashmir (London, 1843)

Stein, M A, "Notes on the Monetary System of Ancient Kashmir," (*N C*, xix, pp. 125-74)

Walsh, E H, "The coinage of Nepal," (*JRAS*, 1908, pp 669-705, 1122-36)

Modern Works

Aravamuthan, T G, *"The Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age"*, (Madras, 1925)

Bagchi, P C, *India and China* (Bombay)

Barua, K L, *History of Kāmarūpa*, Vol I (Shillong, 1933)

Chavannes, E, *Documents Sur Les Tou-Kiue (Turcs) Occidentaux*, (St Petersburg, 1903)

Gait, E A, *History of Assam*, (Calcutta, 1926)

Pires, E, *The Maukharis*, (Madras, 1934)

Sankalia, H D, *Archaeology of Gujrat*, (Bombay, 1941)

Munshi, K M., *The Glory that was Gurjaradeśa*, (Bombay, 1944)

Ojha, G H, *History of Rajputana*, (Ajmer, 1936)

Sastri, H P, *Catalogue of Palm-leaf and selected paper MSS belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal*, (Calcutta 1905)

Stein, M A, *Ancient Khotan*, (Oxford, 1907)

Agarwala, V S, *Harsacarita*, (Patna, 1953)

Ettinghausen, M L, *Harsavardhana Empereur et Poet* (Paris, 1906)

Chatterjee, Gaurisankar, *Harsavardhana*, (Allahabad, 1938)

Mookerjee, R K, *Harsa* (Oxford, 1926)

Sampurnananda, *Samrat Harshavardhana*, (Bombay, V. S 1977)

Tripathi, R S, *History of Kanauj to the Muslim Conquest*, (Benares, 1937)

Vaidya, C V, *History of Mediaeval Hindu India*, 3 Vols (Poona 1921-26)

Basak, R G, *History of North-Eastern India*, (Calcutta, 1934)

Sen, B C, *Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, (Calcutta, 1942)

Articles in Periodicals

Bagchi, P C, "Sino-Indian Relations," (*Sino-Indian Studies* I)

Banerjee, A C, "The Empire of Harsha," (*JAHRS*, vi, pp 147-58)

Banerjee, R D, "Later Guptas of Magadha," (*JBORS*, xiv, pp 254-65)

Barua, B M, "Common Ancestry of the Pre-Ahom Rulers etc" (*IHQ*, xxiii, pp 200-220)

Basak, R G, "Śāśānka," (*IHQ*, III, pp 1-20)

Chattopadhyaya, K C, "Dāmodaragupta Did he die in battle?" (*D R Bhandarkar Volume*, pp 180-82)

Chattopadhyaya, S, "Kanauj after Harṣa's death," *IHQ*, xxx, pp 160-166)

INDEX